The American Ecclesiastical Review

VOL. CXXX, No. 4 APRIL, 1954

CONTENTS

Blessed Pius X: Model for Priests *Joseph B. Collins, S.S.* 217

Knight of Mary Immaculate *Ashley Pettis* 228

Some Moral Aspects of Drug Addiction *Giles Staab, O.F.M. Cap.* 238

The Our Father. Part II *Thomas J. M. Burke, S.J.* 250

Two Recent Explanations of the Church's Necessity for Salvation *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 259

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Walter J. Schmitz, S.S., and Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

Attendance at Motion Pictures 270

The Significance of the Imprimatur 271

Sacramental Penances 271

Shortage of Sacred Particles 272

Recitation of Prayers at Holy Communion 273

Epiphany Holy Water 273

Golden Wedding Anniversary 274

Kyrie at Sung Mass 274

Statue of Beatus 275

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1954, by the Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Display of Flags 275
Baptistery Prolbme 275
Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament 276
ANALECTA ..... *Thomas Owen Martin* 277

BOOK REVIEWS

The Case of Cardinal Aloysius Stepinac, *by Richard Pattee* 282
Indulgences, the Ordinary Power of Prelates inferior to the Pope to grant Indulgences, *by Joseph Edward Campbell* 284
The Training of Converts. Proceedings of the Fordham University Conference of Mission Specialists 285
The Index to the New Testament and the Topical Analysis to the New Testament, *by Aloysius H. Seubert* 286
Religious Men and Women in the Code, *by Joseph Creusen, S.J.* 287

For Priests only--

CLOSED RETREATS

SIXTEENTH YEAR

Sacred Heart Retreat House

RETREATS BEGIN APRIL 25th.

For Schedule and Information Address:

REV. R. R. GOGGIN, S.J.

Phone: Fonda 3-7381 **Auriesville, N. Y.**

BLESSED PIUS X: MODEL FOR PRIESTS

Joseph Sarto, the future Pius X, always wanted to be *a priest.* As early as he could remember he would say, "Mother, I wish to be a priest." With a pious mother's innate reliance on divine help, she always nodded assent even the while she looked over her large and growing family and thought of the small earnings of Signor Sarto from his small farm and his modest position as caretaker for the little municipality of Riese.[1]

Joseph Sarto was born on Jan. 2, 1835, in a family of eight. He was barely eleven years of age when he trudged the long road to Castelfranco to attend its Latin school and prepare for the priesthood. The years sped by. In November 1850 the youth, already tried by difficulties and proved by diligence and hard work, was given a scholarship to the seminary at Padua. He was a bright pupil, apt and capable of long hours of study, and he led his class throughout his years in the seminary. During the summer vacations the seminarist took up some gainful work in his native village, helped the pastor during the day and taught the catechism to children and youth during the evening hours.[2] Going about in his plain black cassock, which marked him apart from his friends and neighbors, the young Levite exemplified for all to see the simple unaffected virtues of the Boy of Nazareth in Joseph's workshop.

John Sarto, head of the family, died in 1852 while his son was still in the seminary. It was a hard blow for the young student, and he felt obliged to remain at home and help support his widowed mother and her young family. But she would not hear of it. "We'll get along," she said. From the seminary Joseph Sarto wrote, "Here I read and work and prepare myself for

[1] Angelo Marchesan, *Papa Pio X nella sua vita e nella sua parola e nelle suo opere* (Einsiedeln: Benziger and Co., 1905), p. 27. This is a definitive work on the life of Blessed Pius X up to the time he became Pope. The present article owes much to the research of Marchesan.

[2] *Articoli per il processo apostolico del Servo di Dio Pio Papa X* (Rome: Pontificia Universita Gregoriana, 1943), p. 6. This is a primary source on the life of the Pope; it is published by the official postulator of the Cause for beatification and canonization.

the life of solitude and study that will be mine as a priest."[3] He was given charge of the classes in ecclesiastical chant during his last year and was made director of the seminary choir. At length, on Sept. 18, 1858, in the ancient cathedral of Castelfranco, Joseph Sarto was ordained by the Bishop of the diocese of Treviso.

CURATE AND COUNTRY PASTOR

Father Sarto, not unlike many a young priest before and since, spent a few weeks at home in Riese and then received his appointment as curate in the run-down little village of Tombolo. The pastor was an excellent priest of high ideals and unaffected simplicity, but his health was not good. The young curate plunged into the work with fresh zeal and energy. There was so much to do; so little time to do it! Then began a constant round of duties: preparing his sermons, instructing the children, looking after the sick, helping the poor. A niece of the pastor testified before the Roman commission on the beatification process that Father Sarto was "in a constant activity."[4] When asked if he ever slept, he calmly replied that four hours were usually sufficient for him.[5] The janitor of the church would find him already in the sacristy when he went to open the church at sun-up, and the villagers would see their young priest in the dark shadows of the sanctuary late at night wholly rapt in prayer. Father Constantine, the pastor, wrote of him, "I had orders to mould this young assistant to the duties of a parish priest; in fact however the opposite is true. He is so zealous, so full of good sense, and other precious gifts that it is I who can learn much from him." And then this gentle and wise old man indulged in a bit of prophecy which is startling in the light of future events. "Some day or other he will wear the mitre; of that I am sure. After that—who knows?"[6]

Farther Sarto spent nine busy years in Tombolo and the time was already past for a change. It was not his suggestion but the Bishop's which prompted him to take an examination for the large and important parish of Salzano. On May 21, 1867, the appointment came for the young pastor then thirty-two years old,

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

[5] Benedetto Pierami, *The Life of the Servant of God, Pius X* (Turin: Casa Editrice Marietti, 1929), p. 23.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

but much to the ill-concealed chagrin and disappointment of the people of Salzano. The aristocratic surroundings and traditions of this ancient city had always been graced by pastors of gentle birth who were as a matter of course honored canons of the cathedral. An outraged committee from the parish waited upon the Bishop to clear up what they said was a "manifest injustice." Very quietly the Bishop announced, "I am giving you the curate of Tombolo as your pastor." Then he added, "In this I am doing Salzano a great favor."[7]

The first Sunday in the parish was one of suppressed excitement and expectancy. The church was filled to capacity with those of low and high degree. The pastor ascended the pulpit and briefly spoke of the work which he planned to do in the parish. In a few rapid but effective strokes he dispelled all their prejudices. A visitation of every home in the parish followed, and the warm personal charm and simplicity of the young pastor won the hearts of all.

A MODERN PASTOR

There is something of our own time in the way Father Sarto attacked the problems of his parish. He saw at once a desperate need for religious instruction. He himself conducted catechism classes for children and for youth; and for adults he explained the Gospel and the simple rudiments of the faith on each Sunday and holyday. He insisted on attendance at instructions in lieu of devotions. "What will the devotions of the Church profit you if you do not understand their meaning?" he said. "And how can you understand the homilies and sermons if you are ignorant of the primary and most necessary truths?"[8] He introduced the method of dialogue instruction in the church on Sunday evenings. A priest from a neighboring parish and Father Sarto occupied separate pulpits in the sanctuary from which they could discuss points of doctrine and answer each other's objections against the faith which were current at the time. This novel teaching technique attracted large crowds of people, many of whom came from nearby cities and villages. Some neighboring pastors complained to the Bishop that their churches were empty on Sunday evenings

[7] *Articoli,* p. 15.
[8] E. Canon Schmitz, *Life of Pius X* (New York, 1917), p. 205.

because of Father Sarto's popular instructions. "Go and do thou likewise," was the Bishop's rejoinder.[9]

In a few years the parish of Salzano was known as the best organized in the diocese. The pastor believed in giving the people every kind of service. There was the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament with its devotion of the Forty Hours. Father Sarto preached and counseled frequent Communion for adults and early First Communion for little children when such practices were unknown—a presage of the future Decrees of Pope Pius X! There was a society of the Sacred Heart in the parish, and a sodality of the Blessed Virgin with special solemnities during the month of May. He organized the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and saw to the training of its teachers and parish leaders. In keeping with his life-long love for the liturgy, Father Sarto organized and trained a choir of young men to sing during the divine services, and he saw to it that the ceremonies of the Church and its liturgy were carried out with dignity and precision. The church itself was newly decorated every few years and he kept both church and rectory in simple yet adequate order and repair.[10]

The pastor of Salzano took a keen interest in the economic and social conditions of his parish. A large silk factory which employed more than three hundred women and a large number of men was located in the city. The owner and the pastor were on friendly terms and it was due to the latter's influence that employer-worker relations were always harmonious. To obtain the most favorable prices for produce of the farms, Father Sarto advised his farmers on what to grow, and when to sell. He set up a local banking system for loans and credit and he took a leading part in protecting his people against extortionate landlords.

The pastor's study was open to the public night and day. He met all with a welcome smile. The poor of the parish and the sick and unfortunate were the special concern of his great heart. "Everything I have," he said, "is theirs." Father Sarto's two sisters were his housekeepers. They complained that they could keep nothing of value in the house, not even food! All went to the poor and to the first suppliant that knocked at the pastor's door. His greatest joy was in giving.[11] At the bedside of the

[9] *Articoli*, p. 16.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 19.
[11] Marchesan, pp. 156, 164.

sick he was a consoling angel. Indifferent to personal danger in the cause of the sick, the pastor frequently risked his life, especially during the great epidemic of cholera which swept the country in 1873.

The parish of Salzano was transformed in the space of less than nine years. The Bishop's prediction came through. When he was about to bring Father Sarto to the See city of Treviso, he wrote as follows: "A wonderful religious spirit flourishes in the parish; there is a happy community all united around their holy and devoted pastor."[12]

UBI HONORES, IBI ONERA

On the morning of Sept. 17, 1875, the pastor of Salzano set out for Treviso. To avoid a painful leave-taking he departed early before any of his parishioners were about. He could look back over eighteen years of faithful labor, unheralded by any self-sought publicity. Now high honors and heavy responsibilities awaited him. He was appointed chancellor of the diocese, canon of the cathedral chapter, and spiritual director of the diocesan seminary, where he took up his abode.

Canon Sarto at once assumed the duties of the chancery office. Owing to the poor health of Bishop Zinelli, he practically ran the diocese. As spiritual director, he took the seminarists to his heart and gave them fully of his time and experience. "I am only a poor country pastor," he told them, "and I have this place only by God's holy will."[13] The work meant regular conferences, confessions, and spiritual advice and counsel at all times. As canon of the Cathedral, he faithfully carried out its duties. Despite all these weighty charges, Canon Sarto continued his interest in the religious instruction of the people. He organized catechism classes for the youth attending public schools from which all religious instruction was banned; and on Sundays he taught groups of students the principles of good citizenship as he prepared them for reception of the Sacraments. The vice-rector of the Seminary protested one day that the Canon should relinquish the work of teaching children because of the pressure of so many tasks. "It is my duty, am I not their father?" was the answer,[14] which is

[12] G. del Gal, *Sotto una Tiara* (Pompei, 1936), p. 61.
[13] Schmitz, p. 222.
[14] F. A. Forbes, *Life of Pius X* (London, 1918), p. 71.

reminiscent of a similar reply of the great chancellor of the University of Paris, John Gerson, on being told that teaching children their catechism was beneath his dignity.

Canon Sarto displayed a perfect balance between a high seriousness demanded of his many offices and the lighter side of his character. This was apparent in his life at the seminary where his confreres attested to his charm, his jokes, quick repartee, and general pleasantry. When after four years, he was made vicar general of the diocese in 1878, all felt that higher honors were in store. Yet in him was no trace of human ambition. He felt too keenly the sacred calling of the priesthood. "The priest," he told the seminarians, "lives in a permanent state of war against the forces of evil." He looked upon those who aspired to the glory of insignia and color with a smile of indulgent compassion.[15]

One day, after nine years had passed in Treviso, the Bishop summoned his chancellor and led him to the little chapel. There together they prayed for some moments. The Bishop then handed over a letter of appointment to be Bishop of Mantua. Canon Sarto turned pale and refused at once to accept the tremendous responsibility. Again, on Nov. 13, 1884, he knelt before Leo XIII and begged to be relieved of the appointment. "You have written a letter asking to be dispensed from the bishopric," the Pontiff told him. "But it is Our wish that you go to Mantua." Writing later of his failure, the Bishop-elect cried out, "What a cross! What a calvary!"[16]

A SAINT TO TROUBLED MANTUA

Bishop Sarto was consecrated in Rome by the Cardinal Vicar on Nov. 10, 1884. He took up his work as chief shepherd of a diocese that was in sore straits. It had defied the work and sacrifices of two predecessors. There was an underpaid, negligent clergy without respect of the people and lacking in self-confidence. Only one student was ready for ordination. The faith of the people was weak: many of the intellectuals were seduced by liberalism and freemasonry; the working people and peasants in large part were Socialists, and in general the practice of religion

15 Del Gal, p. 90.

16 *Articoli,* pp. 30-31.

was confined to a few of the older women and children. An apostle was urgently needed.[17]

The new Bishop lost no time in bringing a plan to fruition. He opened the seminary which had been closed for the past ten years. A few years later it had 146 carefully selected students. He organized religious instruction classes, and ordered a unit of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in every parish.[18] The Bishop himself often took part in the teaching. He also could be found on many mornings in the confessional of the cathedral or in one of the parishes or missions in his diocese. In a short time Bishop Sarto won over his priests with his solicitude for them and his love for the souls of their people. The faithful in turn gave themselves wholeheartedly to the practices of their religion under the inspiring leadership of their chief shepherd. "Your new Bishop," he told them, "is the poorest of all, but he has one ambition only—to see all the children under his care united in one large happy family, and under its shelter their souls will be safe."[19]

CARDINAL PATRIARCH OF VENICE

The See of Venice fell vacant in 1892. It was breathed about that Bishop Sarto would be elevated to the queen city of the Adriatic. But he himself effectively squelched such rumors and a year passed. He gave no more thought to the matter until, in May, 1893, he was informed officially that it was the express wish of Pope Leo XIII that he assume the duties of patriarch of Venice. On June 3, 1893, Bishop Sarto received official notice of his promotion to the See of Venice and was informed that he would be named a cardinal. He received the red hat from Leo XIII on June 15 and was formally confirmed as patriarch of Venice in a secret consistory held on the same day. "This," the Pontiff pointed out, "will be to open to your zeal and charity a wider field of endeavor."[20]

[17] Joseph B. Collins, *Catechetical Documents of Pope Pius X* (Paterson: St. Anthony Guild, 1946), p. xviii.

[18] *Articoli*, pp. 46-49. We are told that the Bishop of Mantua urged his priests and catechists to send him new methods and techniques for teaching religion in the diocese. For the best contributions, Bishop Sarto offered premiums and public awards (*ibid.*).

[19] Del Gal, p. 69.

[20] Pierami, p. 69.

The Venetians received Cardinal Sarto with loyalty and enthusiasm. He found in Venice all the problems that Mantua had posed, only magnified and intensified. His prodigious capacity for work, his great ability to plan and to organize, combined with his long experience as a pastor of souls were crowned with deep and lasting success in building up and vitalizing the faith and devotion of his people. Nothing escaped his zeal: the seminary, new parishes, pastoral visits, the press, church music, relations with the civil officials, public ceremonies and anniversaries. On the fourth Thursday of each month the Cardinal held a day of spiritual retreat for his priests at which he preached and gave the conferences and meditations. Then there were his beloved poor and the institutions that kept him penniless. "I was always poor wherever I have been," he once remarked, "but here I am destitute."[21]

The Cardinal's day was a full one. He arose early as he had done since boyhood. He made his preparation for Mass which was offered at six. Then followed thanksgiving and a cup of black coffee was brought to him by his sister. The Cardinal made his meditation and read his Breviary. At nine the business of the day was begun. He had no set hours for audiences; for he met visitors on any day and at any hour. At two o'clock there was a frugal lunch. After a brief siesta and a cup of coffee, the Cardinal transacted official business or went on a visitation of a parish, hospital or school. Sometimes this was made in the course of his accustomed walk, which on doctor's advice, he rarely omitted. Toward evening he made a visit to the Blessed Sacrament and at nine after reciting the Rosary with his sisters and the members of his household, the Cardinal partook of his dinner. It was always light: some meat and vegetables, bread and wine. Going to his private office, the Cardinal finished his prayers and engaged in reading and writing until midnight when he retired.[22] And so another novena of years passed. The Cardinal had spent nine years in each of his previous assignments: Tombolo, Salzano, Treviso, Mantua. Now in his ninth year in Venice, word was brought to him of the death of Pope Leo XIII. Six days later on July 26, 1903, Cardinal Sarto left for Rome and the conclave. The rest is history.

[21] *Articoli*, p. 167.

[22] Pierami, p. 106.

"I TAKE THE NAME OF PIUS"

Cardinal Gibbons used to tell how it was the humility and holiness of the Patriarch of Venice which decided the issue in the election of Pope Pius X on Aug. 4, 1903. Despite his protests and tears he was chosen to succeed the great Leo XIII. It was characteristic of the new Pope that he chose the name Pius as he said, "in memory of the holy Pontiffs whose patronage I gravely need, and who have withstood bitter persecutions against the Church and themselves."[23] Pius X expected trials and suffering as the vicar of Christ, who was Himself never a stranger to suffering. Of such is the essence of the priestly vocation. "We do not enter the priesthood to seek a life of comfort. . . . To be obliged to labor constantly and to be a priest," he wrote, "is one and the same thing."[24]

The eleven years' reign of Pius X can well be regarded as one of the most fruitful, and in its effects the most lasting in the long history of the Papacy. Much of what the Church enjoys today a half century later in the diverse fields of its work can be traced to the fertile mind and practical initiative of Pope Pius X. Whether it affects the inner administration of the Church: the Roman congregations, the Code of Canon Law, the reform of seminaries, or matters of reorganization: church music, Catholic Action, catechetical instruction through the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Eucharistic decrees, the deathblow to Modernism—all reflect a Pope of action. Throughout all his pronouncements and achievements, one focal point stands out clear and impelling; it is the essential and necessary work of the priest, as a man of God, in the divine economy of salvation.

Pope Pius saw this even more clearly when he became head of the Church. His expressed ideal was "to restore all things in Christ." To achieve this, the Pope affirmed that he must have good priests, well trained in approved seminaries. The many decrees and reforms of the Pontiff throughout his reign bear directly on the priests and bishops of the Church. His solicitude for them was only exceeded by his paternal love. And still, Pius X knew how to temper love with justice. He could be severe and very firm when the occasion warranted. One day a priest who

[23] *Articoli*, p. 75. [24] *Ibid.*, p. 60.

had been remiss in his duties was told by the then Bishop of Mantua that he must do a period of penance away from his parish. When the priest demurred, the Bishop looked at him firmly yet kindly and said, "Now, Father, you will do this for me, to please me; because it would make me very unhappy if you would not be able to say Mass."[25]

"THE EXHORTATION TO THE CLERGY"

Just what the priesthood meant to Pius X can be seen in the "Exhortation to the Catholic Clergy" which he wrote in 1908 on the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination. This classic text is an incomparable exposition of the nature of the priesthood, its ideals, its dangers and rewards, and the means of perfection for the priests of today. Looking back over the span of fifty years as a priest, the venerable Pontiff, working in the quiet of his study in the Vatican, drew a picture of the good shepherd of souls. It is a description made unconsciously of the priestly virtues which he had preserved all his life.

The priest, according to the "Exhortation," is like a mirror in which the faithful can easily see and imitate his virtues and fervor. "It is not possible for a priest to be good or bad alone," he wrote, with the influence of the priest on others in mind. "The character and life of a priest cannot but have lasting effect on his people."[26] The high vocation of the priesthood, therefore, demands a holiness of life beyond the ordinary. This is fostered and preserved in the soul of the priest by the graces received in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, in daily meditation, spiritual reading, and through mortification of the senses and detachment from this world.

The saintly Pontiff warned his priests against what later writers have called "the heresy of good works." Priests are obliged to cultivate the interior virtues. Pius X condemned the view that "the merit of a priest should consist in being entirely occupied in working for others, and thus pay little heed to the virtues which perfect himself." The Pope demanded that "the priest must go out among his people," and he shall not wait for them to come to

[25] Francis B. Thornton, *The Burning Flame* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1952), p. 103.

[26] *Haerent animo, ASS,* XLI (1908), p. 278.

him. This is the burden of the message of Blessed Pius X to the priests of his day and of all time.

On Aug. 20, 1914, broken hearted over a world in flames and carnage, Pope Pius X died. Like a weary laborer in the fields, who falls worn out with arms filled with sheaves of a full harvest, the saintly Pope gave over his life to God.

For years faithful clients and friends have invoked Blessed Pius X in their troubles and necessities; and they have not been disappointed. The Church herself has issued official approval of the intercessory power of the Blessed Servant of God in the documents of beatification and canonization and, as someone has affirmed, in the "almost embarrassing" number of miracles that have been offered in testimony to the power of Pius X.

Like the little Therese of Lisieux, whose cause toward sainthood was introduced by him, Pope Pius X is already "spending his heaven in doing good on earth." When he as Saint Pius is invoked among the blessed, none will have greater cause to rejoice than the priests who always shared so fully in his tender charity.

JOSEPH B. COLLINS, S.S.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

OUR LADY AND THE CHURCH

As Mary had been to Jesus in His lowliness, such will she be in His exaltation. As she had served Him in His weakness, so will she serve Him in His power. By her pure motherly hands had His tender infant limbs been swathed, nourished, and tended; and every want felt by humanity supplied, until the Sacred Body she had given Him was laid to rest in the sepulchre—so now, it is her proper place to guard, to cherish, to watch over and to supply with all a mother's devotion—the woman's grand privilege—the needs of His Mystical Body, until the consummation of all, when she will present to Him His Immaculate Bride.

—From "Mary and the Church Militant," by E. M. Shapcote, in *AER*, XXXII, 3 (March, 1905), 262 f.

KNIGHT OF MARY IMMACULATE

The halo of sanctity shines more brightly from a distance. It is difficult to perceive it in the present: its formation is much too gradual a process. Our vision becomes so accustomed to the stages of evolution, that we see primarily the concrete, the natural, in saints in the making, leaving for future generations, or ages, the discovery that the light of their sanctity looms through the vistas of time. The luminosity of sanctity is actually heightened by juxtaposition with the long shadows and gloom of distance.

It has been said that "our contemporaries wait for saints." One may safely say, without cyncism: "They will probably wait until future generations discover them." There are, of course, exceptions. One of the most notable deviations from a rather wide generalization is that of Maximilian Kolbe, Friar Minor Conventual, who, since his martyrdom for Charity's sake, in the Nazi Concentration Camp of Auschwitz, in 1939, has received an accolade of praise and veneration seldom accorded any man by his own generation, and by those who knew him. To date, more than twenty publications, in many languages, have appeared: "fiorette," as well as narratives of his deeds and extraordinary accomplishments.[1]

The complete picture of Maximilian Kolbe may not be confined to a mediaeval frame. His sanctity was remarkable, both in life and in death. One was the logical preparation for the other. The story of Father Kolbe's unusual life has to do with a fusion rare in any age, in that he combined great holiness with accomplishments on the natural plane which constituted a "success" from popular, worldly standards. Father Kolbe's "timeliness," based upon eternal values, gave his life special value, for his own age, and for future generations to wonder at and admire. For he saw everything about him, in the natural world, from the standpoint of the supernatural, utilizing the most modern, scientific

[1] In English: *The Knight of the Immaculate,* by Jeremiah Smith, O.F.M. Conv.; published by Conventual Franciscan Publications, St. Anthony-on-Hudson, Renssalaer, N. Y.; *Our Lady's Fool,* in two different translations from the French, the original by Maria Winowska, published by the Mercier Press, of Cork, and the Newman Press of America, respectively.

developments, for the ultimate good of mankind and the glory of God, fusing them in a glorious union for the service of the Almighty, through the Immaculate Heart of Mary. To this end, Father Kolbe utilized radio, the most modern printing equipment, airplanes, the building crafts, etc., reaching millions throughout the world.

The subject of this heroic life and death possessed, outwardly and physically, none of the necessary concomitants which we customarily associate with "success." He was not, surely, of heroic stature, although of arresting appearance. In his earlier years, while a seminarian in Rome, he was afflicted with tuberculosis of the lungs. Throughout his life, 1894-1941, he was periodically confined to hospitals, sometimes for what seemed to be the last lap of life's journey. From such intervals of enforced meditation, Father Kolbe emerged with new zeal, fresh plans whose actualization was, from all natural standards, impossible of achievement—and an unbounded faith in the divine intercession of the Immaculate Heart of Mary. And unfailingly that trust was rewarded, to the amazement of all. In addition to the handicap of physical limitations, Father Kolbe was a Franciscan, a true "poverello," with no available funds for his "wild" schemes, and with no apparent source from which to draw the material needs to realize them.

Fr. Maximilian Kolbe, Friar Minor Conventual (commonly known as the "black Franciscans"), was born in 1894, in a small village near Lodz, Poland. His parents were poor, notably devout weavers, unable to afford money to give all of their three living sons an education, which under Russian domination, could not be had without cost. Raymond, our Maximilian, next to the youngest, remained at home, helping his mother in her valiant efforts to supplement the father's slight money-making capacity, by running a little shop selling odds and ends generally termed "necessities"—foodstuffs and otherwise.

The accounts of Raymond's earliest years picture a normal youth, "brisk, impulsive" in nature, somewhat "headstrong," not infrequently incurring his mother's displeasure and the rod. But a crisis, altering the whole course of young Kolbe's life, occurred at the age of ten. Following a tempestuous episode one day, Raymond's mother exclaimed in distress: "I do not know what will become of you!" Thereupon the repentent child disappeared be-

hind a cupboard, where he spent some time kneeling in front of an altar of Our Lady. This incident marked a remarkable change in his behavior. He was seen frequently to disappear behind the cupboard, often emerging with tear-stained face and red eyes. To his mother's demand for an explanation, Raymond recounted that he had prayed to the Virgin, asking Her to tell "what would become of him." In response, the Immaculate appeared in a vision, holding two crowns, one white, and one red. She explained that the one was for purity, the other for martyrdom, and bade him take his choice. Raymond replied: "I choose both!" Then Our Lady smiled and disappeared. From that time on, young Kolbe's life was dedicated to the Heart of the Immaculate. Later, Father Kolbe was frequently referred to as the "Knight of the Immaculate."

After the vision of Our Lady and the choice of the two crowns, young Kolbe's life changed rapidly, taking definite shape. His very spotty, early education had been supplemented by efforts of the village priest and the town druggist, the latter, in particular, having assisted materially. When it was announced that a minor seminary had been opened at Lwow "for youths desiring to consecrate themselves to Our Lady in the Order of St. Francis," Raymond and his elder brother asked permission of their parents to attend. Both youths were able to qualify, were accepted; and, during the ensuing years, received their basic training for the priesthood.

From the first, Raymond showed a marked aptitude for mathematics and science, at the same time advancing in spirituality: never losing vision of Our Lady. But, at sixteen, doubt entered his mind as to the best way of serving her: whether in the priesthood, or in a military career. Just when both Raymond and Francis, his brother, were about to go to the Provincial and ask for a release to enter military service, their mother was announced. Both she and their father had decided to enter religious orders. The boys promptly went to the Provincial and told him that they wished to enter the novitiate. The Provincial accepted the request, and, the following day, both were received, Raymond becoming Friar Maximilian.

A year later, when he had "pronounced the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience for three years in the Order of the Friars Minor Conventual," Friar Maximilian's superiors, recognizing his

exceptional abilities, decided to send him to Rome for continuation of his studies. At first, the youthful Friar demurred. But, realizing that he was using his own reason, instead of obeying the will of God, he decided upon "blind obedience." Years later, in recalling his indecision at this time, Father Kolbe asked: "In truth, what would have happened if Father Provincial had decided according to my reasons? Would there have been *A Knight of the Immaculate* today? Would there have been such a place as the City of the Immaculate? Is not then the glory of obedience blind submission to the Lord?" It was this "blind submission" to the will of God, through the Heart of the Immaculate, which became the motivating power of Father Kolbe's life, paving the way towards its glorious culmination in martyrdom.

The story of Friar Maximilian's studies in Rome discloses a closely interrelated intellectual and spiritual development, resulting in a perfect union of his faculties and spirit for the life that was to follow. Living at the International College of the Order, on the Palatine Hill, Friar Maximilian pursued his studies at the Gregorian University. In November, 1914, he pronounced his solemn vows; a year later, at twenty-one years of age, he received a Doctorate in Philosophy from the Gregorian University. Ordination to the priesthood followed in 1918; and one year later Father Kolbe, at twenty-five, received his Doctorate in Theology at the International Seraphic College of the Order.

Such an exceptional record of scholastic achievement, however, is not to be separated from the simultaneous growth of Father Kolbe's spiritual life. The day he said his first Mass, he made a pact with Thérèse of Lisieux, not canonized at that time: "I shall pray that you may be raised to the glory of the altars, but on condition that you will take charge of all my future conquests." In prayer, in the midst of studies, the youthful religious was preparing for "running the course," for his service in battling for the Immaculate. He spent much time in church, in deep prayer, where he was often discovered by companions: "The chapel would seem deserted when one entered it, but, after awhile, one would notice a slight noise. He would be there, hidden behind the high altar. His whole attitude betrayed a powerful interior activity."

In the midst of spiritual and intellectual growth, it was while in Rome that Father Maximilian founded an organization destined

eventually to enlist millions of followers throughout the world: the *Militia Immaculatae* (not to be confused with the "Legion of Mary"). In his own account of the founding of the Militia of the Immaculate, Father Kolbe ascribed the reason for its founding to the "lack of enthusiasm of some within the Order." He was "greatly affected by those young men who come to us with the highest ideals and sometimes dilute, while in the friary, their ideal of sanctity. So I thought: 'What can I do?' " Father Maximilian, recalled that, as a young boy, he "bought a statuette of the Blessed Virgin for a few pennies. At the boarding school at Lwow during Holy Mass, I prostrated myself face to the floor and promised the Blessed Virgin—that *I would fight for Her.* I had no idea then how I was going to do it, but I envisioned a struggle with material armies." Later, Father Kolbe related: "I confided this difficulty to the Prefect, who commuted my promise to the obligation of reciting every day a *Sub tuum praesidium.* I recite it to this day, especially now that I know what kind of combat the Immaculate had in mind."

The founding of the *Militia Immaculatae* was the first external maneuver of one who was to fight valiantly for Our Lady, and enlist the support of millions of cohorts in the battle. It was as a man of action that Father Kolbe was to gain world-wide fame and exert supernatural influence. Yet, how little did those who witnessed his extraordinary accomplishments realize the source of his power. And here it is important to remember that he did nothing on his own. Although the "idea was born," he sought the advice "of his Spiritual Director, Fr. Alexandre Basile, S.J.," and did not proceed until he had received from him the assurance that "this idea came from the Immaculate." It was only then that, as Father Kolbe put it: "I decided to set myself to work immediately, in the name of Holy Obedience."

The Roman climate was hard on the young religious. There is record that he suffered to such an extent that his Prefect, Father Cicchito, sought medical advice. But his symptoms of circulatory deficiency and violent headaches were known only to the "Father Rector and a few friars," for he never complained. Father Kolbe continued the organization of his new Society, the first meeting being held with the permission of the Father Rector in October, 1917, with seven members in attendance. Later, there were many

difficulties to surmount, with deaths of two of the initial members, even defections among the surviving; but, finally, after the Society had received the written blessing of the Most Reverend Father General, Dominic Tavani, "from that day new members came in endlessly and in great numbers. During this first period, the activity of the *Militia Immaculatae* consisted in praying and distributing the Miraculous Medal. Father General even gave us money to buy some." Of the two departed members of the Militia, Father Kolbe said: "they went home to the Immaculate," to plead their cause. Later he was to say: "Every time things seem to come to a standstill, the Immaculate calls one of my group to heaven, in order that he may aid us more efficaciously."

The Militia of Mary Immaculate had 25 members before the end of 1917. Pope Benedict XV gave the Society his approval and blessing in April, 1918. By 1920, its membership was 450; by 1926, there were 84,225; by 1939, 691,219; and today there are more than 2,000,000. The Militia was canonically established as a Pious Union, January, 1922; and, four years later, Pius XI granted it many indulgences, saying: "The Militia of Mary Immaculate has already produced such an abundance of spiritual works that it justly merits a pledge of our Pontifical benevolence." The same Pope raised the Militia to the status of a Primary Union, April, 1927. Father Maximilian's dream of world conquest for the Heart of the Immaculate was becoming an actuality, with units of the Militia in Italy, Poland, Roumania, Holland, Belgium, America, and Japan.

In plans for conquest, for the conversion of the *whole* world, while yet Brother Maximilian, he foresaw the use of modern scientific inventions, as a means of communication with all peoples, drawing them together, through the Heart of the Immaculate. Press and cinema were envisaged as weapons in the battle. He realized only too well that the forces of the Devil had abused these achievements of civilization for their own evil ends; but he said: "It is for us to direct them into the proper channels . . . we should bestir ourselves and labor to reconquer the position taken by the enemy." The fighting spirit in Father Kolbe even led him to enter public debates on the streets of Rome, combatting speakers attacking the Church of God.

Father Kolbe returned to Poland in July, 1919, "so far gone with tuberculosis, that the doctors gave him about three months to live." In spite of his weakness, he was badly needed in a country bled white by the ravages of war. Father Kolbe was appointed to a Professorship in a Franciscan house in Cracow. But the fire of his enthusiasm burned not less valiantly. His Militancy soon earned him various nicknames: "the razor," "the hammer," "the dreamer," and, because of characteristically slow movements, due to illness, the appellation: "Maramalde." He was suffering greatly—but never complained. A collapse was inevitable. Father Kolbe was sent to a sanatorium, where he remained most of the year 1920. Even at the sanatorium, he began holding discussions and giving instructions to non-Catholics, drawing many into the true Church. A "Rule of Life," written while at the hospital, beginning: "I must be a saint, and a great saint," breathes an extraordinary devotion to Our Lady as "the instrument of Divine Mercy." Such declarations as "My life (in every one of its moments), my death (where, when and how), my eternity: all is thine, O Virgin Immaculate. Do with me as you desire. All is possible to me in Him who is my comfort through the Immaculate," eloquently attest the source of that power which was soon to manifest itself in mighty works.

Released from the sanatorium, but by no means cured, Father Maximilian returned to Cracow for "a new era in his life." He decided to issue a bulletin, in order to increase membership in the Militia. Tracing the various steps in the development of this project, from its modest beginnings, with no funds and great plans, to the erection of the most modern and complete printing plant in all Poland, near Warsaw, is a complete story in itself. When the initial project was started, Father Maximilian was faced with failure to such a degree that the Provincial Superior exclaimed: "Now see what it is to attack the moon with a spade," and warned him to "extricate yourself, without compromising the Friary." The exact sum of money to cover first costs was found in an envelope, on the altar cloth, following prayerful intercession to Our Lady.

But the plans were not realized without the pains of birth. From Cracow, the growing creation of Father Maximilian's spirit through the Heart of the Immaculate was moved to Grodno, where there

would be increased facilities. There were strikes, high costs to combat—but help always came. The priest-manager himself helped operate presses, day and night. The circulation was increasing by leaps and bounds. And, again, there was an enforced interruption, with Father Maximilian back in the sanatorium at Zakopane.

When Father Maximilian was able to return to Grodno, it became apparent that a more suitable place for printing, packing, and mailing was required for publications rapidly increasing in number and frequency. After surmounting seemingly insuperable obstacles, land was miraculously procured twenty-six miles from Warsaw, and construction of the "City of the Immaculate," Niepokalanow, was begun, and dedicated to Our Lady Dec. 7, 1927, the eve of the Feast of the Immaculate Conception. Niepokalanow eventually became the largest religious community in the world, with a college, hospital, buildings for novices and professed members, an electric plant, fire department manned by Brothers, a radio station erected in 1938, and an airport the following year. In addition to the original bulletin, *The Knight of the Immaculate,* there were now nine others, including a daily—with a total of millions of readers!

The "success" of the City of the Immaculate, exciting envy and even an unsuccessful law-suit by commercial interests to suppress the growing competition of the publications, was such that Father Maximilian had the "wild idea" of establishing another such project in Japan. The best-known pictures of Father Kolbe are those taken with a beard, especially grown for this new missionary venture. Having established the new community, behind a hill near Nagasaki (where it was to survive the atomic bombing), Father Kolbe turned towards India. After laying the ground work for the expansion of his multifarious activities there, he was recalled to Poland to attend a Provincial Chapter. Here he was elected Superior of the Polish Niepokalanow, where he would not only have to supervise publication, with a weekly printing of a million copies, but direct workshops, as well as guide the lives and activities of seven hundred religious, comprising priests, seminarians, novices and lay-brothers: the largest religious community in the world!

The spiritual talks he gave at that time, as Superior, have been recounted by many who heard them. Fr. Flaviano Slonimski,

O.F.M. Conventual, now living in Rome, who was received into the Order by Father Maximilian, tells how true Franciscan simplicity, with devotion always to the Heart of the Immaculate, was presented in the unanswerable logic of a syllogism, as was Father Maximilian's characteristic habit. The earlier studies in Philosophy had taken deep root—nourished always by love and devotion to Our Lady.

Sept. 19, 1939, the German police drove into Niepokalanow. The religious, having been assembled in the public square, were loaded into trucks and taken to a German concentration camp. Niepokalanow was turned into a hospital by the Nazis. Father Maximilian was soon released by the Germans, returning to Niepokalanow December 8, the Feast of the Immaculate Conception. His "heart bled at the sight of the destruction—even the statue of Our Lady at the entrance of the City of the Immaculate was gone." He labored valiantly to restore some semblance of order, so that the chapel, at least, was made presentable. Gradually, more religious returned, and community life was resumed.

On Feb. 17, 1941, Father Kolbe was again arrested, with four other priests. They "were dangerous to the safety of German troops," and Father Kolbe was accused of aiding the Polish Resistance. This was not true, inasmuch as he had even refused permission to print clandestine newspapers, for fear of jeopardizing the work of the apostolate.

Father Kolbe finally arrived at the prison camp of Auschwitz (in Polish, Oswiecim), where he suffered from pneumonia, as well as physical abuse from the Nazi guards. The Commandant of the camp, Fritsch, turned "the lazy priests" over to "Bloody Krott," who assigned them to "digging sand and stones for construction of a wall around a crematory." Father Kolbe would say: "They may kill our bodies, but they cannot kill our souls . . . if we die, we shall die peacefully, resigned to the Divine Will." Under the brutality of "Bloody Krott," Fr. Maximilian finally collapsed. But he only said: "For Jesus Christ I am ready to suffer more. The Immaculate is with me and is helping me."

When Father Maximilian was somewhat recovered, he was moved into "Block 14." One of the prisoners escaped from the "Block," and the Nazi custom at Auschwitz was that ten must pay the penalty of death, in reprisal. The attempts of the Ger-

mans to find the fugitive were fruitless. Father Maximilian was not among those called by number to pay the penalty. But one of the victims sobbed: "My poor wife, and my children. I shall never see them again!"

Little Father Maximilian stepped forward. Commandant Fritsch commanded: "Stop! What does this Polish pig want?"

Father Maximilian, "a rapturous smile lighting up his eyes," said softly: "I want to die in place of that father of a family. I beg you to accept the offer of my life." Father Maximilian, now Number 16670, obeyed the order: "March!" walking away with the condemned, to death—and eternity.

The ten were doomed to die by slow starvation. As the SS guard clanged the door behind them, he laughed mercilessly: "You will dry up like tulips."

But this group was different. Instead of moans and wailing, the guards were dumbfounded at sounds of prayer, the Rosary—even voices raised in hymns—coming from the cell where the condemned were huddled.

One by one they died, the prayerful voices trailing off in the growing dusk of earth. Father Maximilian asked for nothing—uttered no complaints. The guards came to respect him and wonder: "We have never seen a prisoner like him."

But four of the doomed lingered on too long, including Father Maximilian. The prison authorities sent the infirmarian to break the weak link still binding them to the transient, plunging them into eternity. When Father Maximilian saw the executioner approach with the hypodermic of carbolic acid, with "Ave Maria" on his lips, he extended his arm for the injection. It was August 14, the Vigil of Our Lady's Assumption. After the Polish orderly, who had been a witness, horrified and unable to stand more, had fled, he soon returned and opened the door of the cell. He reported: "He was no longer alive; but he seemed as if he were still alive. His face was unusually radiant. His eyes were opened wide, staring into space. He seemed as though in rapture."

ASHLEY PETTIS

Rome, Italy

SOME MORAL ASPECTS OF DRUG ADDICTION

Before analyzing some of the moral implications of drug addiction, we may find it helpful to get an idea of both *drugs* and *addiction.*

In the class of drugs that cause addiction, there are two big divisions—sedative or narcotic drugs, and stimulant drugs. In general, sedative drugs relieve pain, cause mental and physical inactivity, have a numbing effect, induce sleep, and in larger doses cause stupor, coma, or even death. These narcotics are by far the more popular type of drugs, because they tend to counteract physical and mental distress. The basic and oldest known sedative drug is opium. However, in this country the derivatives are far more common—morphine, heroin, codeine, dilaudid, metopon, pantopon, paregoric, and laudanum. Demerol and methadone are synthetic substitutes for morphine. It is important to note that all these narcotics are not merely habit-forming, but are strictly of the addiction type, because they set up an emotional dependence in the one who uses them, as well as a physical dependence, technically known as withdrawal illness; and because they create within the system a need for ever larger doses, technically known as tolerance.

The barbiturates, such as amytal, seconal, pentothal, and barbital, are definitely drugs of a sedative nature, causing emotional dependence, withdrawal illness, and tolerance; but they are often not considered in a class with the opium derivatives. In general, they are not covered by federal legislation (in this country); and consequently create a special danger by the very fact that they are sold over the counter, often without a doctor's prescription. They are effective aids as presurgical relaxing agents or as specifics in the treatment of certain diseases, such as epilepsy; but when used indiscriminately, they may have tragic effects. Dr. Harris Isbell, director of research at the United States Public Health Service's drug center at Lexington, Ky., a specialist in the field of drugs, says that chronic barbiturate intoxication is a true drug addiction, and in the long run more damaging than opium, morphine, or heroin. While the morphine addict can sometimes hold down a job and live a fairly normal life, the

barbiturate addict usually goes to pieces socially. Moreover, the withdrawal treatment necessary for barbiturate poisoning is longer, more painful, and much more dangerous.[1]

Marihuana (*cannabis sativa;* also hemp) is frequently classed as a sedative; but since it acts variously as a sedative or a stimulant, it is really in a class by itself; and it is covered by special legislation in the United States. Although marihuana is not so habit-forming as opium, it is nevertheless a dangerous drug, more intoxicating than alcohol and more apt to lead to mental disease. Marihuana is a comparatively new drug in the United States, and so cases of mental disease resulting from its use are infrequent; but it is an ancient drug in Africa and the Orient, and it accounts for one-fourth of the patients in mental hospitals in Egypt and India.[2]

Since marihuana (used in the form of cigarettes, brown in appearance and very weedy in odor) has become a fairly popular drug in the past few years, it may be good to take a closer look at its effects. The first reaction in smoking marihuana is anxiety, but shortly after this there follows calm and euphoria (a sense of well-being). Frequently there is exaggerated and distorted sense perception; and there is also an exaggerated perception, which is in reality only apparent. The smoker feels that he has become much more penetrating than usual, while actually, being intoxicated, he is much more shallow. There is often a sense of elation, or even hilarity. Sometimes, though not always, there are strong sex impulses. Finally sleep is induced, and when the smoker awakes, he seems no worse for the experience.[3]

Dr. Lawrence Kolb, the Assistant Surgeon General of the United States (in 1938), makes telling observations on the question of marihuana and criminality:

> The excessive use of marihuana will certainly cause some persons to commit crimes, but the prevalent opinion that anyone who smokes a marihuana cigarette and becomes intoxicated by it will have criminal

---

[1] *Newsweek,* XXXV (May 29, 1950), 47.

[2] W. Overholser and W. V. Richmond, *Handbook of Psychiatry* (Philadelphia, 1947), p. 97.

[3] Condensed from a quotation from Dr. Lawrence Kolb, in Overholser and Richmond, *op. cit.,* pp. 97 f.

impulses is in error. Marihuana is in this respect like alcohol, but probably somewhat more dangerous because of the peculiar sensations and hallucinations produced by it. It releases inhibitions and distorts the judgment, and the criminally inclined person with no inhibitions and distorted judgment is likely to convert his criminal impulses into action, but the normal person who becomes intoxicated with marihuana is like the normal person who becomes intoxicated with alcohol, likely to be a nuisance to himself and to others but not dangerous.[4]

Dr. Kolb continues on the deleterious effects of marihuana:

> Continued use of the drug causes insanity in many cases. . . . The insanity may be of several different types, although most patients eventually recover when the use of the drug is discontinued.[5]

Among the stimulant drugs used for a physical or moral "lift," the most important is cocaine, a white, odorless powder that is bitter to the taste. It is taken in the form of snuff ("snow") or by injection into a vein. Cocaine causes ill-adjusted people to feel a sense of exhilaration; but it can also cause an acute secondary effect of imaginary persecution, so that sometimes the user may viciously attack those around him. Cocaine certainly causes emotional dependence—which is the basic element in addiction—but not withdrawal sickness or tolerance. In spite of this, cocaine is an extremely dangerous drug. Addicts disintegrate rapidly. They lose all moral sense, readily desert their families, and consort with characters of the lowest level. They are physical wrecks and succumb easily to various diseases or die of heart failure.

Passing from drugs, to *addiction,* we ask first of all, what causes drug addiction? The reasons for addiction are complex, depending upon association and environment, but depending much more upon the type of personality. Very frequently the drug addict is a person faced with a physical problem in the form of pain or illness, or a moral problem in the form of an inadequacy of some kind, such as a marked inferiority complex. Drugs, like alcohol, blot out the unpleasantness of reality.

The Kolb classification is a scientific classification of addicts:[6]

(1) Normal individuals accidentally addicted through medication in the course of illness.

[4] *Op. cit.,* p. 98. [5] *Loc. cit.*

[6] This is substantially the classification. Cf. *op. cit.,* pp. 99 f.

(2) Persons laboring under a psychopathic diathesis, or constitutional tendency towards drugs to counteract maladjustment. "Their fundamental defect is an ill-defined emotional instability which finds expression in a search for new thrills, excitement and pleasure."[7]

(3) Psychoneurotics, or people suffering from obsessions, phobias, anxiety, and various emotional disturbances.

(4) Psychopathic personalities, or people who, though not psychotic, are gravely abnormal, and usually have an anti-social history not connected with drug addiction.

(5) Inebriates, and often their addiction comes from using drugs to "sober up" after alcoholic sprees.

(6) Real psychotics, although this type of addict is rare. The most common type of drug addict is the diathetic addict counteracting maladjustment.

Drug addiction, which usually occurs only among physically mature persons, showed a large increase about 1948, owing to a new phenomenon—juvenile addiction. It has been estimated that there are 15,000 juvenile addicts in New York alone, although some authorities in the field insist that there is a tendency to exaggerate the statistics grossly. Other cities with a high addiction rate are Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, St. Louis, New Orleans, Baltimore, and Washington. There are two negative comforts in the situation: for the present, teen-age addiction is strictly a big-city problem; and youthful addicts, being largely normal personalities, respond more readily to treatment than their elders.

There is a standard pattern of behavior among juvenile addicts. The procedure of addiction is usually from drinking to marihuana, suggested by addicted pals, and from marihuana to heroin on a dare. The heroin is first taken in the form of snuff, which is wasteful. Soon the hypodermic needle is used for subcutaneous injections; but gradually the youngster becomes a "mainliner," injecting the drug directly into a vein. The body's tolerance to heroin builds up fast. Complete addiction develops within two or three weeks of intravenous injections. If the addict doesn't get his dose, he suffers unspeakable tortures, including vomiting, violent sweating, stomach cramps, diarrhea, and nervous twitching.

[7] M. J. Prescor. From Overholser and Richmond, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

He needs a dose when he wakes up every morning, and at least two more during the day, although he prefers five. When merely getting under way with his habit, the misled teen-ager needs $5 to $10 a day; as an addict, he needs $15 a day, or $5400 a year. Right here is an added problem of an ethical and social nature. To get this impossible sum, the girl addict may take to shoplifting or prostitution, the boy addict to any kind of thievery. Home thefts are a good clue to juvenile addiction in the family, and family ties and social responsibility mean nothing. Juvenile addicts have been known to say simply that they would kill their own mother if she stood in the way of their dope.[8] One of the worst angles is that teen-age addicts mislead other young people and often act as messengers for dope peddlers to assure their own supply.

Harry J. Anslinger, United States Commissioner of Narcotics, giving the social and psychological background of juvenile drug addiction, asserts that most of the corrupted teen-agers come from families in which there is no proper parental control or training in decent personal habits.[9]

There is no reasonable room to doubt that drug addiction is harmful to the body, disturbing the functions of the brain, nerves, stomach, muscles, and intestines—and this in various ways according to the nature and use of the various drugs. In fact, drugs can be fatal, not only of their natural tendency, but also accidentally. For example, the heroin content in different seemingly identical capsules may be sufficient to cause sudden death.

There are a number of moral problems connected with the abuse of drugs. Many of the moralists do not consider the matter at all, while others treat it shortly after the tract *De ebrietate,* and they apply the same principles.[10] Merkelbach gives a typical and clear exposition of the principles:

It will be a help to state shortly the following principles concerning

---

[8] For a revealing study of juvenile addiction, cf. H. Brean, "A Short—and Horrible—Life," *Reader's Digest,* Sept. 1951, pp. 1-4.

[9] "The Facts about Teen-Age Drug Addicts," *Reader's Digest,* Oct. 1951, pp. 137-40.

[10] These authors treat the use of drugs under the general heading of *ebrietas:* Aertnys-Damen, Iorio, Noldin-Schmitt, Sabetti-Barrett, Vermeersch. Merkelbach treats the matter under the virtue of sobriety, and Ubach handles it under the fifth commandment.

the use of narcotics (morphine, opium, cocaine, chloroform, ether, etc.), either to alleviate pain or to dull the senses, since the privation of the use of reason and great harm to one's health can result from them:

1. The passing use in so restricted a quantity that it produces no other effect than the restoration of strength and the quieting of the nerves is licit.

2. The use of a larger quantity or the frequent use, either for pleasure alone or to satisfy the craving for narcotics, which becomes very vehement from their frequent use, is gravely illicit if notable harm to health or life *can* follow from the practice. It is slightly illicit if the harm to one's health or the shortening of one's life is certainly not notable.

3. The use in such a quantity that the senses are numbed and a temporary privation of the use of reason follows is a grave sin if there is no just cause, as in the case of drunkenness; but it is licit for a proportionately grave cause of necessity or utility; for example, to prevent sharp pain or to cause immobility in a major surgical operation.[11]

To reduce these general principles to practical details, we may find it helpful to state the problem by means of specific questions.

Do the narcotic laws bind in conscience?[12] It would seem that they do. Fr. Henry Davis, S.J., in the first volume of his *Moral and Pastoral Theology,* treats at length the question of the binding force of civil laws in general. He gives a summary of opinions showing that some moralists hold that civil laws bind in conscience *per se,* while others feel that they bind *per accidens,* according to the wording of the law, or the interpretation of the experts, or the common estimation, or according to the subject matter of the law itself. Father Davis himself defends the view that civil laws are *per se* merely penal in England (and the reasons he gives would hold for our country); but he adds a warning that can cover the question we are aiming at: "It must not, of course, be concluded that no civil laws bind in conscience. Very many indeed do so because they are by their nature conducive to the protection and peace of the State." Finally he cites and approves the opinion

[11] Merkelbach, Benedictus H., O.P., *Summa theologiae moralis* (Montreal, 1949), II, n. 989.

[12] For a statement and analysis of the federal narcotic laws, cf. Harry J. Anslinger, "Control of the Traffic in Narcotic Drugs," *The Merck Report,* Oct. 1951, pp. 33-38.

of Vermeersch that only those laws bind in conscience and are, therefore, to be obeyed under sin which ought to have such moral force for the sake of the common good.[13] The narcotic laws are a determination of the natural law, they are necessary for the protection and peace of the state, and they ought to have moral force for the sake of the common good. There may be a temptation to compare the narcotic laws with the Eighteenth Amendment, but the comparison is hardly *a pari.* The Amendment condemned at one fell swoop the major abuse of alcoholism and a great amount of innocent drinking. The very nature of illicit drugs practically rules out the innocent angle.[14]

Is it a grave sin to smoke a marihuana cigarette? That it should be a grave sin to smoke *one* cigarette could come only from one or more of the following reasons. (1) It would be seriously harmful to one's health or notably shorten one's life. Neither is the case. (2) It would lead proximately to hopeless addiction. Physicians agree that this is not true. (3) It would create a proximate danger to one's moral life. This could be the case with morally uninhibited persons. It would probably not be the case with disciplined individuals. (4) It would cause complete intoxication. From the description of marihuana smoking given above, it would seem that the smoking of *one* marihuana cigarette would be sufficient to cause perfect intoxication, and would therefore be gravely illicit.[15] Since marihuana is more wildly intoxicating than alcohol, a person would probably be running a grave risk in smoking

[13] Davis, Henry, S.J., *Moral and Pastoral Theology* (New York, 1949), I, 147 f.

[14] There is as yet no federal legislation in the United States regulating the sale and use of barbiturates, although there is strong sentiment in favor of this specific legislation. Laws in this matter could be quite helpful because of a large amount of "sleeping pill" addiction. However, since the use of barbiturates, although habit-forming and dangerous, is still intrinsically much more controllable than narcotic addiction, it is doubtful if the proposed legislation would bind in conscience. Probably millions of people are taking barbiturates with more or less good results and no proximate danger of addiction.

[15] The deprivation of the use of reason, as is generally agreed, is the necessary element for perfect intoxication; but this by no means demands stupor. Cf. Edward F. Angluin, O.S.B., *The Use and Control of Alcoholic Drink* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1933), p. 38.

his first cigarette, although it is conceivable that a person with past experience (objectively culpable) may have a solidly probable reason to believe that one cigarette would cause only imperfect intoxication.

Is it always a grave sin for a drug addict to take a potent dose? Apart from the medical use, for example, to counteract postoperative pain, *per se* it would be a grave sin. However, at this point we step into the vast ill-explored field of the pathological states of mind. Reputable psychologists and psychiatrists warn us about compulsive alcoholics, and what is said and written about alcoholism and compulsion can be applied *ceteribus paribus* to severe drug addiction.[16] Many of the moral theologians take cognizance of the pathological states in the question of the *voluntarium*.[17] Drug addiction is a poisoning of the system, and the drug addict is physically ill. That he is mentally ill is evident at times from the unreasonableness of his actions. It is quite probable that drug addiction can reach such a compulsive stage that there is not sufficient control of the will for grave imputability.[18] However, even when drug addiction is of an extremely compulsive nature, one must be very careful not to conclude that *every* impulse is an irresistible impulse. The only legitimate conclusion is that *some* impulses *may be* irresistible impulses. In reaching a conclusion about individual lapses, perhaps the best criterion for the confessor or guide is the apparently sincere insistence of the addict himself. Nevertheless the confessor must be cautious in accepting

[16] For an excellent study in this field, cf. John C. Ford, S.J., *Depth Psychology, Morality and Alcoholism* (Weston College, 1951). The whole work is helpful in understanding compulsive acts; on p. 72 he compares alcoholism and drug addiction.

[17] Cf. for example, A. Vermeersch, *Theologiae moralis principia, responsa, consilia* (Rome, 1945), I, nn. 88-89. Antonius Lanza, *Theologia moralis* (Turin, 1949), I, 140-41, treats morphinism and cocainism specifically under toxic psychoses in the section on the *voluntarium*.

[18] We are dealing here with *material* sin. Loiano says: ". . . every involuntary and non-imputable transgression of the law is a material sin, while every voluntary and imputable transgression is a formal sin. Therefore a material sin and a *formal* sin differ only by the exclusion of free consent, because a material sin is a violation of the law only, while a formal sin is a violation of the law and conscience; that is, both proximate standards of morality, the objective and the subjective" (*Institutiones theologiae moralis* [Turin, 1934], I, 380-81).

an addict's judgments at face value. He is almost bound either to rationalize in the direction of innocence or to overestimate his culpability on account of the hopeless feeling of guilt that he has concerning the whole sordid matter. In the last analysis, since the confessor is not an expert in either normal or abnormal psychology, he must leave the final judgment to God.[19]

Can a drug addict be obliged in conscience to undergo the cure? There are several medical facts basic to an answer to this question. First of all, a real drug addict *can* be cured at home by his local physician, but results in attempts of this kind are very discouraging. It is next to impossible for the family doctor to control the source of supply; and an addict, even with an excellent intention, will usually continue to get his drug if it is humanly possible. Moreover, most general hospitals will not handle drug addiction, because they are set up neither to control the supply of the drug nor to manage the very necessary psychotherapy that must follow the withdrawal. Practically, the cure of drug addiction is an institutional case and highly specialized at that. There are two federal rehabilitation hospitals[20] and possibly several state hospitals, all in all, hopelessly inadequate for the number of addicts. The next medical point is that withdrawal of the drug—even controlled withdrawal—is an extremely painful experience both physically and mentally. There is intense depression. Another fact that must be borne in mind is that the cure is a long process, usually taking a minimum of four months. The fact that many patients leave prematurely accounts for the low percentage of cures—about 20 percent. From the moral angle, there are three fundamental goods to be considered—the *bonum proprium,* the *bonum familiae,* and the *bonum commune.* In general, the addict is in a more or less desperate condition physically *and morally;* and since he has an excellent chance of breaking the addiction, *per se* he is

[19] Evidently the addict can be responsible *in causa;* but there are two things to be noted in this regard: (1) it may be that repentance has cut off any connection with the *voluntarium,* and what remains is pure compulsion; (2) the addict may understand the *voluntarium in causa* very inadequately or he may be in a state of complete moral confusion, and the explanation of the *voluntarium in causa* would either drive him deeper into his addiction or leave him with added fear. Fr. Ford analyzes this point well. Cf. *op. cit.,* pp. 66 ff.

[20] One in Lexington, Ky., and one in Fort Worth, Texas.

obliged.[21] Since the addict is usually an economic burden to his family, a reproach to their good name, and often a scandal because of his frequent drug intoxication, *per se* he is obliged. Finally the *bonum commune* requires that the addict be obliged. He is a social problem in himself and an abettor of illegal traffic. The fact of his necessary absence from his family and from society over a gravely inconvenient period of time could hardly excuse him, because he is ordinarily less than useless to his family and to society at large. However, *per accidens* he may be excused for economic reasons or because of the lack of accommodations in an institution, while private hospitals and individual physicians consider it impossible to handle his case.

The withdrawal procedure in the cure of drug addiction is to administer a standard narcotic (usually methadone) in steadily decreased doses. Is this permissible? It is quite possible that in the initial doses the substitute drug is administered in intoxicating quantity. If we are to believe medical testimony and the testimony of converted addicts, there is certainly a *gravissimum incommodum,* the actual extent of which only an experienced specialist can judge. If the physician judges that the pain and anxiety should be controlled by a substitute narcotic as an analgesic, his judgment can ordinarily be trusted in the way moralists trust the judgment of the surgeon dealing with postoperative distress. Moreover, the substitute narcotic used in the cure is the most effective means found for gradually tapering off withdrawal illness and adjusting the body to its normal condition. In view of this, the substitute narcotic partakes of the nature of a true remedy, with two effects—drug intoxication and the general long-range improvement of physical and mental *and moral* health. Only the good effect is intended, and the proportionately grave reason is present, so the substitute drug may be used. However, the quantity must not exceed what is reasonably necessary.

[21] We are confronted here with the *ordinary* and the *extraordinary* means of preserving one's life. Means that were extraordinary a century ago are ordinary today. Thomas J. O'Donnell has a thoughtful treatment of this point. Cf. "Modern Medical and Surgical Means for the Preservation of Life" (*Linacre Quarterly,* XVIII [Feb. 1951], 22-31). Moreover, when we consider the obligation of using means in the case of the addict, we have first of all a moral problem personally, and then we have to look beyond the addict to his family and the common good.

A cognate question is: *may a physician prescribe a drug for a drug addict?* The supposition is that we have the case of an addict who is either not in a position to undergo institutional treatment or who refuses to do so, say, because of his fear for his reputation. Federal law permits a physician to prescribe a drug for an addict, with the understanding that the prescription is not meant as a surreptitious source of supply but at least remotely as an attempt at a cure; and this would coincide with the natural law in the matter. If there is a case of not really aiming at a cure but merely containing the addiction within reasonable bounds, the doctor may administer slight doses, unless it becomes rather evident that containment is impossible and advancing addiction will result.

What is the morality of administering morphine or a comparable drug in a case in which the doctor is morally certain that he is making an innocent drug addict? Evidently the case is *per se* gravely illicit.[22] However, it is a well-known fact that in the treatment of certain illnesses, for example, repeated heart attacks, the repeated use of a powerful narcotic is an accepted means of preventing death. As one physician expressed the matter, "I believe a live drug addict is better than a dead man." His belief could be justified by the principle of double effect. Since the principle of double effect in this situation involves a delicate balance of the physical order (prevention of death) and the moral order (drug addiction), the doctor would have to judge closely the moral evil permitted; and the evil would have to be judged from the angle of the patient under treatment. If the patient is a normally controlled person who would be capable of containing the addiction within reasonable limits and gradually overcoming it with the proper help, probably the use of the narcotic would be justified. But if the patient is the type that is mentally, emotionally, or volitionally so disturbed in his makeup that drug addiction would be an insoluble and uncontrollable moral problem, it is difficult to see any justification for the physician's principle; and the difficulty increases in as far as one can foresee that an uninhibited patient would be a moral risk for the common good.

It may not be out of place to warn the priest confronted with a case of drug addiction that his theological studies do not make him

[22] Sabetti-Barrett, *Compendium theologiae moralis* (New York, 1931), p. 152.

competent in either psychology or psychiatry. His job is to deal with souls, while being aware of the possibility of pathological conditions. This is another opportunity for the priest to appreciate the help of the medical profession.

GILES STAAB, O.F.M.CAP.

Capuchin College
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for April, 1904, contributed by Fr. H. Borgmann, C.SS.R., is entitled "Eastertide in Days of Old." It is an interesting account of the manner in which the feast of Our Lord's Resurrection was observed in medieval England. Among the traditional features were the Easter eggs, the paschal lamb, and special herbs for the feasting. It was also a custom, we are told, to pass around a handball in church on Easter Sunday, to indicate that the faithful could now engage in sports, forbidden during Lent. . . . "L'Affaire Loisy" is a pathetic account, by Fr. V. McNabb, O.P., of the events that led up to the condemnation of the Abbé Loisy by the Holy See in December, 1903. . . . In his serial "In Father Martin's Library" Fr. A. Waldon discusses the training of altarboys. . . . Fr. F. P. Siegfried, defending the *Lex Orandi* of Fr. G. Tyrrell, speaks of "the genuine and permanent value of what Fr. Tyrrell has accomplished in his present as well as his preceding work". . . . An anonymous writer, signing himself M.D., discusses "The Ideal Catholic College." He denounces excessive supervision and coercion in the training of college youth, declaring of the Catholic college boy: "His college life should be a joyous life; his religion should be a joy; the trusting by his masters to his honor and not to their *surveillance*—that bad old system which produces more hypocrites than saints—should be his proudest privilege". . . . In an article titled "The Pope and Reform in Church Music" Fr. W. Stockley vigorously denounces some abuses that had found their way into Catholic church music and calls for a wholehearted acceptance of the Pope's prescriptions toward reform. . . . In the Analecta we find the Encyclical of Blessed Pius X proclaiming the jubilee year of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. . . . Fr. J. A. Walsh, director of the Propagation of the Faith in Boston, makes the request that the *Review* present regularly a page on Mission Notes and News.

F. J. C.

THE OUR FATHER

PART II

THE PETITIONS

The first petition: Sanctificetur nomen tuum

According to Bonaventure we ask that the glory and perfect knowledge of God be strengthened in us.[31] Thomas says that we ask that the name of God be manifested so that it may be known and held as holy.[32] Both Thomas and Suarez quote with approval St. Augustine's statement: "We do not ask that the name of God become holy, but that it should be regarded as holy by men. We ask that God should become so well known to men that they will regard nothing as more holy, and that they will fear giving offence to God more than to anyone else."[33] Maldonatus has perhaps the neatest statement of the meaning of the petition: "The name of God does not mean merely the word, God, by which we call Him, but rather the regard which men have for God. It embraces everything which we can mean when we say that we sanctify God, when we fear Him, love Him, cherish Him, when we increase His glory, when we celebrate His goodness or His sanctity or His majesty."[34]

We intend in this petition that all men sanctify the name of God. Augustine stresses the evil consequent upon the neglect of God's name. "Ask that what is always holy in itself, should be sanctified in you. Sanctified? Regarded as holy, not contemned. And realize that when you seek this you seek your own good. For it is to your own damage to despise the name of God. It does not injure God."[35]

The second petition: Adveniat regnum tuum

Bonaventure applies the words especially to eternal beatitude. In the petition we ask God to "give us that spirit of mind which will enable us with pureness of heart to realize, at present by faith, that God is king, so that in the future we may see the king

[31] Bonaventure, *Opera omnia* (ed. Peltier, Paris, 1871), X, 208.
[32] St. Thomas, *Sermones et opuscula* (ed. Raulx, Paris, 1881), 116.
[33] Augustine, *Opera omnia* (ed. Caillau, Paris, 1842), XIV, 220.
[34] Maldonatus, *Commentarium in quatuor evangelistas* (Paris, 1621), 144d.
[35] Augustine, *Opera*, XVIII, 179.

face to face."[36] Thomas notes three traditional meanings, the vindication of God's supreme rule over all men, the glory of paradise, the reign of God in oneself.[37] In the *Summa* he quotes with approval the opinion of Augustine expressed in the letter to Proba that in the petition we excite our own desire for the kingdom so that it might come to us and we may reign in it. Augustine also writes: "We desire that the kingdom of God come to us and that we may be found in it. For His kingdom shall certainly come, but of what use to you if you find yourself on the left side."[38] This is in keeping with Augustine's sentiments in his four sermons on the Our Father where he stresses the final judgment as the true coming of the kingdom, when the rule of God will be made manifest to all.

Maldonatus is very definite in his view of what the "regnum" signifies. Following Theophylactus and Rupertus he maintains that "the kingdom of God means the final triumphant rule of God everywhere, when His enemies will be in subjection under His feet, and God as St. Paul says 'erit omnia in omnibus' (I Cor. 15: 28)."[39] Since he appears opposed somewhat to the views of Augustine and also those of Thomas and Suarez, it is worthwhile to quote more fully the view of Maldonatus. He writes:

> For it is evident that here we are not seeking our kingdom but the kingdom of God. For the three first petitions, as we have said, are directed towards God; the others relate to ourselves. The meaning then is not that God would reign in our hearts, or that we should reign with the blessed—for this would relate primarily to ourselves—but that God should reign absolutely and without an enemy. Thus we pray, Thy kingdom come, as though we were sons praying to obtain for our kingly Father a peaceful kingdom and victory over His enemies, not that we, but that He should reign.[40]

Suarez having noted three interpretations of kingdom as either the rule of God in the just through grace, or the rule of eternal beatitude, or the completed and consummated rule which God shall have at the end of the world when God shall be all in all

[36] Bonaventure, *Opera,* X, 209.
[37] St. Thomas, *Sermones . . .,* 126-30.
[38] Augustine, *Opera,* XVIII, 179.
[39] Maldonatus, *op. cit.,* 145b.
[40] *Ibid.,* 145c.

(Maldonatus' view), joins them in somewhat the same fashion as Augustine and Thomas, saying: "We beseech that the rule of God shall begin immediately and shall persevere and grow until it is perfected."[41]

In the objection to his thesis he gives what is in some ways an explanation of but also a refutation of the position of Maldonatus.

> You may say: therefore we are asking for something for ourselves and not for God, although Christ teaches us to pray not for our reign but for the reign of God. For, as we have said in the beginning, the first three petitions pertain to God Himself. I reply by conceding that in this petition we seek a great good not only for ourselves but also for the one for whom we pray. For, as we have said in Book One, it is inseparable from all prayer, that not only do we ask something from God for Himself but also for ourselves; and conversely although we pray for ourselves, we can at the same time seek primarily, as I have said, for the good of God Himself, intending principally His glory and honor. Both aspects are contained in this petition: for without doubt we are asking something for ourselves, whether it be grace or glory or the help of the Holy Spirit, in order that we may adore the Father in spirit and truth. For this is His reign, to be adored and cherished by men for Himself.[42]

The third petition: Fiat voluntas tua sicut in coelo et in terra

Maldonatus says that our petition is that in all things the will of God should be done not only by us but in us; just as Christ who could not sin requested that the will of God be done not only by Him but in Him. We say "as in heaven" because there nothing resists the will of God and all obey at His gesture.[43] Augustine gives many metaphorical interpretations. The common literal interpretation according to Thomas, Suarez and Maldonatus is that the precepts of God be obeyed as perfectly by men as by the angels and the blessed.

Augustine plays on the respective roles of God and man in accomplishing a deed. "Make me not to resist your will, God. And thus you pray for yourself and not for God. For the will of God shall be done in you, even though it is not done by you."[44] And again: "Nothing is done by you, which He does not do in

[41] Suarez, *Opera omnia* (ed. Berton, Paris, 1859), XIV, Lib. 3, c. 8, n. 11.
[42] *Ibid.*, n. 12.
[43] Maldonatus, *op. cit.*, 145e-146a. [44] Augustine, *Opera*, XVIII, 179.

you. But sometimes He does in you that which is not done by you (Numquam fit a te, quod non ipse facit in te. Sed aliquando facit in te, quod non fit a te)."[45]

Thomas has a rather extended treatment of this petition. First he gives the example of a sick person who would be stupid if he asked a doctor to do his will rather than the doctor's will. "A sick man wishes to be helped by a doctor, but he does not wish for specific remedies according to his own will, but according to the will of the doctor. If the sick man wanted his own will to be done he would be stupid. Thus we ought to ask nothing of God but that His will be done concerning us, that is, that His will be fulfilled in us."[46] The first thing that God wants of us is that we should have eternal life.

> When a man attains eternal life, it is said that he is saved, and this is the desire of God. "Yes, this is the will of Him who sent me, that all those who believe in the Son when they see Him should enjoy eternal life; I am to raise them up at the last day" (*John* 6:40). This will however is already accomplished in the angels and the blessed who are in the land of the Father because they see God and know and enjoy Him; but we desire that just as the will of God is accomplished in the blessed in heaven, so it may be accomplished in us who are on earth.[47]

In order that we arrive at beatitude God wants us to observe His commandments. This will of God is fulfilled in the just in heaven but it is not yet fulfilled in sinners and therefore, according to Thomas, we pray that the will of God be done "on earth, that is among sinners, just as it is done in heaven, that is among the just."[48]

Thomas notes that in the manner of the petition an important truth is contained. Christ did not teach us to say "Let us do" or "Do" but "Let it be done" (not "Faciamus" or "Fac" but "Fiat"), because, in the opinion of Thomas, He signified that for eternal life both the grace of God and the will of man are necessary. "Do not then presume on yourself but trust in the grace of God; do not neglect, but use your zeal; and so He does not say: 'Let us do,' lest it would seem that the grace of God does nothing in the work; nor does He say 'Do,' lest it would

[45] *Ibid.*, 180.
[46] St. Thomas, *Sermones* . . ., 131.
[47] *Ibid.*, 132-33.
[48] *Ibid.*, 134.

seem that our will and effort accomplish nothing; but He says: 'Let it be done' by the grace of God and by our using our zeal and effort."[49]

Suarez goes one step further than the other commentators in making precise the concept of the will of God as contained in this petition. Theologians commonly distinguish the efficacious and absolute positive will of God, and the directive and permissive will of God which is manifested by precept, counsel, prohibition. Some say that in the present petition cannot be included the efficacious and absolute will of God because this will is such that it can not be resisted. We do not seek that this will be done, because infallibly it is done, and just as infallibly on earth as in heaven. Consequently authors say that the words must be understood of the "voluntas signi" (which appears in Suarez' mind to include the directive and permissive will of God), "for this is what Christ signified, adding, 'on earth as it is in heaven,' for it is this 'voluntas signi' which is not fulfilled in the same way on earth as in heaven, and therefore we ought to ask that it be fulfilled by us."[50] Suarez denies that all efficacious will is excluded from this petition and that all of the "voluntas signi" is included. What is contained he calls the "voluntas complacentiae divinae" by which he seems to mean that which God positively wills whether absolutely or conditionally with respect to man's freedom. "For I say that not all efficacious will is excluded from this petition, nor is all 'voluntas signi' included."[51] He proves the first member thus: "That will by which God decreed the death of Christ for us was the efficacious and absolute positive will of God, and yet it was about that will that Christ himself prayed: 'Not my will, but yours be done.' Therefore in like manner we can pray, when we say: 'Thy will be done.' Likewise the will by which God elects the predestined is His absolute, positive will, and nevertheless we rightly ask of God that it be fulfilled, for this we rightly desire."[52] The second member is evident he says. "The second is clear because permission is usually placed in the 'Voluntas signi' and yet we do not seek nor can we seek and desire that whatever God permits be done by us."[53] Suarez thinks

[49] *Ibid.*
[50] Suarez, *loc. cit.*, c. 8, n. 13.
[51] *Ibid.* [52] *Ibid.* [53] *Ibid.*

then that the petition is to be understood of the "voluntas complacentiae" (the positive will of God whether absolute or conditioned, having regard for man's free actions). In this he includes all that God intends or desires to happen, whether He intends this by an absolute and efficacious decree, or whether He desires it by a will conditioned from the part of the object, an antecedent will. "We demand then a conformity with the divine will in all its dispositions which please God. This conformity has a place not only in regard to the directive will of God but especially in regard to the absolute will of God. In this conformity we desire especially to be like the blessed."[54]

Fourth petition: Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie

Bonaventure and Augustine give the meaning of necessities for corporeal life, the Holy Eucharist, or spiritual food of Divine help, to this phrase, "our daily bread." Augustine says that all three meanings can be taken conjunctively, although he appears to favor spiritual food as the proper meaning.[55] Bonaventure likewise says: "It is right then for all three to be taken together; so that in asking for our daily bread we are asking at the same time for the necessary things for material life and for the visible and invisible sacrament of the Word of God."[56]

Suarez gives the same meanings for the petition, but stresses bread only in the two senses of necessities for life and the Holy Eucharist. Noting the difficulty of calling the Eucharist our daily bread since there is no command to receive it daily, he answers that we should have the desire of it each day.[57] Though he does not use the phrase, it sounds very much like the practice praised in some authors of making "spiritual communions" when one is unable to receive the Blessed Sacrament. When speaking of the meaning, daily necessities, Suarez says that the prayer teaches us the mode and moderation to be evinced in seeking material things. "Our," according to Suarez, recalls to our mind that we should ask for things suitable to our condition and our indigence; "daily" admonishes us not to be worried about the future, but to trust in God.[58]

[54] *Ibid.*, nn. 14-15.
[55] Augustine, *Opera*, XIV, 224; cf. *ibid.*, 225-26; XVIII, 181, 182, 195.
[56] Bonaventure, *Opera*, X, 209.
[57] Suarez, *loc. cit.*, c. 8, n. 19. [58] *Ibid.*, nn. 20-21.

In his exposition of the Lord's Prayer Thomas appears to favor the things necessary for daily corporeal life. He states that the prayer shows that even temporal goods are provided by God for us.[59] All need their daily bread. For if God took away His hand, as Augustine notes, even those with most wealth would have nothing.[60] Before God we are all poor. "Give us eternal things, You have promised a kingdom, do not deny us the aids to attain it."[61]

Fifth petition: Et dimitte nobis debita nostra sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris

Our sins are like debts, as Maldonatus notes, "because by them we are in bondage to God as though we were tied down by debt. This appears from Luke, who in place of debts says sins."[62] St. Thomas notes that all men, even saints, should say this prayer.[63] All should recognize and confess their indebtedness. The petition teaches us the fear and humility which should be ours in this life. As Augustine says: "Those who are baptized and remain in this life are affected in some way by mortal weakness, so that even if they are not shipwrecked, they ought to keep bailing out the bilge water. For if the bilge water is not bailed out, little by little it enters until the whole ship is immersed. To make the prayer of this petition is to keep pumping out the bilge water."[64] St. Thomas indicates that the prayer is a symbol of hope because we are confident that despite our sins if we turn to God with the correct dispositions, He will forgive our sins.

Maldonatus notes that the second part of the petition is not a rule by which we are forgiven. "That it is not a rule, is evident: for God forgives us many more debts and much greater ones, and much more generously, and at the same time to much less deserving people, than we are accustomed to forgive to our debtors; greater even than we can forgive."[65] It is not a rule, a measure, but a condition. This condition indicates a disposition which the sinner should have.

Not because this disposition of ours or the remission we make suffices, as some heretics have said, but because without that disposition

---

[59] St. Thomas, *Sermones . . .*, 137.
[60] Augustine, *Opera*, XVIII, 181.
[61] *Ibid.*, 195.
[62] Maldonatus, *op. cit.*, 148c.
[63] St. Thomas, *Sermones . . .*, 143.
[64] Augustine, *Opera*, XVIII, 183.
[65] Maldonatus, *op. cit.*, 148e.

a man can not have true sorrow for his sins, as Augustine rightly notes (*de Civit.* c. 22 and 17). They are wrong therefore who say that a man who does not forgive injuries ought not to use this petition when he says the Our Father. . . . For if a man has at least the desire to gain the grace to forgive injuries, then his prayer is not evil but fruitful. If he does not have even this desire, then his prayer to have sins forgiven is a sorry prayer.[66]

Augustine explains eloquently in connection with this petition why we should pray for our enemies. In his conclusion he says: "Make your prayer against the malice of your enemy that it may die and he may live. For if your enemy should die, you lose as it were an enemy, but you have not found a friend. If however his malice should die, then you have lost an enemy and found a friend."[67]

Sixth petition: Et ne nos inducas in tentationem

Augustine says: "Our prayer here is not that we should not be tempted but that we should not be swept up in the temptation; just as someone who must be tested by fire, does not pray that he should not be touched by the fire, but that he should not be burnt. The furnace proves the vases of the potter, and the test of tribulation just men."[68] Suarez concurs in this opinion. He says that our prayer here is neither to be tempted nor to be free of temptation. "When the Fathers urge this petition against Pelagius, they teach that we pray lest we succumb to temptation. And by this they say we are reminded strongly of our weakness which would lead us to succumb to temptation, even though we are free, unless we were helped by grace."[69] Maldonatus says that we are asking here, mindful of our weakness, not only that we should conquer temptation, but even that we should not fall into a fight with temptation, lest perhaps we might be conquered.[70] Suarez agrees with him only to this extent, that Suarez says we pray also that we may not fall into hurtful temptations. "We pray that we may not fall into damaging temptations. For in these last petitions, as I have said, we ask to avoid evil. Such a damaging temptation is a great evil, but a temptation which is not hurtful

[66] Suarez, *loc. cit.*, c. 8, n. 30.
[67] Augustine, *Opera*, XVIII, 186.
[68] *Ibid.*, XIV, 229-30.
[69] Suarez, *loc. cit.*, c. 8, n. 35.
[70] Maldonatus, *op. cit.*, 151a.

is rather a good thing."[71] We trust in this petition to the prescience and grace of God to protect us.

Seventh petition: Sed libera nos a malo

Suarez offers four traditional interpretations of evil in this petition: first, the devil, which is the meaning followed by Tertullian, Chrysostom, and Maldonatus; second, sin, an opinion favored by Augustine; third, eternal damnation, which is the interpretation of Bonaventure; and fourth, present misfortunes which impede a normal life, which is the interpretation of St. Thomas, and the one which Suarez favors.[72] Suarez urges the convenience of this interpretation. "It is not out of place, in fact it is very fitting, that as in the first part of this prayer we asked of God spiritual goods, and then freedom from spiritual evils, so now after we have asked for the goods necessary to this life, we then ask to be freed from the contrary evils."[73] Suarez says that by present misfortunes we mean all temporal "disadvantages, infectious diseases, hunger, war and the like." Thomas states:

> Above the Lord taught us to ask pardon for our sins and taught us how we can avoid temptations; here He teaches us to ask for protection from evils, and this request is a general one against all evils, namely, sins, adversities, infirmities and afflictions, as Augustine said. But since we have already prayed about sin and temptation, here we ought to pray about all the other evils, namely, the adversities and all the afflictions of this world, from which God may free us.[74]

Amen

"This was added, not to be said by another, but so that the one praying might arouse himself, and by this reflection as it were join his heart and his desires to all the petitions which he has made."[75]

THOMAS J. M. BURKE, S.J.

Weston College
Weston, Mass.

[71] Suarez, *loc. cit.*, c. 8, n. 37.
[72] *Ibid.*
[73] *Ibid.*, n. 38.
[74] St. Thomas, *Sermones . . .*, 151-52.
[75] Suarez, *loc. cit.*, c. 8, n. 41.

TWO RECENT EXPLANATIONS OF THE CHURCH'S NECESSITY FOR SALVATION

The index to Denzinger's *Enchiridion symbolorum* refers to twenty statements or explanations in various documents of the ecclesiastical *magisterium* of the dogma that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church. Since the autumn of 1952 we have also had available the complete text of the Holy Office letter *Suprema haec sacra,* which contains the most complete and detailed exposition of that dogma ever given in a doctrinally authoritative ecclesiastical document. The letter, incidentally, was dated Aug. 8, 1949, but its full text was not published until three years later.

What the *Suprema haec sacra* and the various documents of the teaching Church collected in the *Enchiridion symbolorum* have to say about the Church's necessity for salvation is definitely not something of practical interest to professional theologians alone. This teaching of the *ecclesia docens* is meant for the entire Church, for all the people of God. The dogma that there is no salvation outside the true Church of Jesus Christ is a part, and an important part, of that supernatural message which we call divine public revelation. The people have a right to receive the divinely revealed truth which Our Lord directed to all His disciples.

Yet it is axiomatic that by far the greater number of the people do not, and, practically speaking cannot, obtain their explanations of Catholic dogma directly from the authoritative documents of the ecclesiastical *magisterium.* In their younger days they gain that knowledge in an orderly, yet necessarily in an elementary, way through their catechism lessons. Then, throughout their lives, they receive their instruction in matters of faith from the sermons they hear and from the Catholic books and periodicals they read. In our own time the printed word seems to play an ever increasing part in that process of instruction.

So it is that the book or the article dealing with matters of Catholic doctrine must be judged by inexorably high standards. No man writes a doctrinal work except to convince. It is a necessary consequence of his activity that the people who read his publication will tend to believe that his explanation of a Catholic dogma is true, or, at least, quite acceptable. If he should be

unfortunate enough to present that teaching inaccurately, the final result would be that someone for whose salvation Our Lord died on the Cross would accept as God's teaching something which is not in His revealed message, or would reject some truth which God actually has revealed. Objectively, there could hardly be a more fundamental frustration of the activity of one who sets out to work as an ambassador of Christ than the production of such an effect.

Just as there is no function greater than that of an ambassador of Christ, one who is privileged to bring His divine truths to the people for whom He died, so there is objectively no greater misfortune than to cause people to form a misapprehension of the divine teaching. There are practical and concrete evil consequences of inaccurate doctrinal instruction in the field of morality. Thus it is quite possible that an incorrect notion of the Church, gained through some imperfect presentation of Catholic doctrine, may be the source of lamentable conduct towards the Church itself. Yet the evil of inexact doctrinal teaching is not, in the last analysis, to be estimated in terms of the untoward effects which may or may not follow from it in the practical order. The misrepresentation of Our Lord's divine message is calamitous in itself, when we consider it objectively.

It is clear that a doctrinal book or article does its work properly when, and only when, its content is strictly in line with the pertinent authoritative statements of the ecclesiastical *magisterium*. Naturally, this does not mean that the book or article in question must limit itself to a bare and literal translation of the official ecclesiastical documents which have to do with the subject discussed in the book or the article. But, on the other hand, no literary explanation of a dogma will be in line with the teaching of the *magisterium* if it presents as acceptable or as true some statement manifestly contradicted by or incompatible with a declaration of the *ecclesia docens* on this subject. And, if the teaching contained in some book or article is not completely in accord with the teachings of the Church's *magisterium*, then definitely it is not proper intellectual nourishment for the children of the Church.

Recently two very well written books have been published in our own country. Neither of them is primarily concerned with the dogma of the Church's necessity for the attainment of eternal

salvation, but both of them offer explanations of this teaching. One of these books, *The Living Christ,*[1] by Fr. John L. Murphy, has already gained the widespread recognition to which it is entitled. The other, *Wisdom Shall Enter,*[2] by Fr. Leo J. Trese, will undoubtedly prove to be equally popular. Fathers Murphy and Trese are certainly to be numbered among the ablest exponents of Catholic teaching in our country at the present time.

It is precisely because of the extraordinary ability of these two writers, and by reason of the extensive circulation their most recent literary productions have achieved and will undoubtedly continue to gain, that it is important to examine what their books have to say about the Church's necessity for salvation. Inevitably there will be a great many of our people who will accept as true and as genuine Catholic doctrine the explanations of this dogma contained in these two books. Objectively the people will suffer harm if the teachings contained in these books should be in any way opposed to or incompatible with what the authoritative documents of the ecclesiastical *magisterium* tell us about the meaning of the dogma that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church.

There are a few imperfections in Father Murphy's chapter on "The Church and Salvation" which prevent that chapter from reaching the level of the rest of his book. These should be corrected in the subsequent printings which this volume seems bound to attain.

1) He seeks to give the impression that there has been no important and genuine variance among Catholic theologians in their explanation of the dogma. We are told that "Theologians have regarded the axiom ['Outside the Church there is no salvation'] in different ways in their attempts to explain it, but basically they all say the same thing; it is more a question of words than of ideas. . . . Despite the varying nuances, however, all of them tell us the same thing."[3]

In the *Humani generis,* however, Pope Pius XII mentions,

[1] John L. Murphy, *The Living Christ* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1952), pp. xii+228.

[2] Leo J. Trese, *Wisdom Shall Enter* (Chicago: Fides Publishers, 1954), pp. 144.

[3] *The Living Christ,* p. 105.

among the "poisonous fruits" of the doctrinal novelties with which he is primarily concerned in this encyclical letter, the fact that "Some reduce to an empty formula the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order that eternal salvation may be attained."[4] According to the Sovereign Pontiff, then, there were theologians who explained this dogma inadequately and inaccurately. The teaching that all the theologians tell us the same thing, or even approximately the same thing, about the dogma of the Church's necessity for salvation is quite out of line with the actual declaration of the ecclesiastical *magisterium* on this subject.

2) Father Murphy makes a problem out of the juxtaposition of "two seemingly opposed truths," set forth by Pope Pius IX in the *Singulari quadam.* The author of *The Living Christ* writes that Pope Pius IX "tells us first that 'We must, indeed, hold on faith that no one can be saved outside the Apostolic Roman Church, that she is the only ark of salvation, that whoever shall not have entered her will perish in the flood'; yet, on the other hand, he adds that 'We must equally hold for certain that those who labor under ignorance of the true religion, if such ignorance be invincible, are not held guilty before the eyes of the Lord.' "[5]

In the actual text of the *Singulari quadam,* however, there is not a trace of any even apparent opposition between the two principles enunciated by Pope Pius IX. According to the second of these principles, "qui verae religionis ignorantia laborent, si ea sit invincibilis, nulla ipsos obstringi *huiusce rei* culpa ante oculos Domini."[6] The translation given in *The Living Christ* takes no account of the two words I have italicized in citing the passage from the original. When these two words are excluded from the passage, we have an absolute and bald assertion to the effect that persons who are invincibly ignorant of the true religion are guiltless in the sight of God, a statement which would make invincible ignorance of the true religion look something like a sacrament. When, on the other hand, we look at this passage exactly as Pope Pius IX presented it, we find it to mean that invincible ignorance of the true religion is not a sin, that people will not be blamed and punished by God for being invincibly ignorant of the true religion. Seen in the context of the *Singulari quadam,* this second

[4] *DB,* 3019.
[5] *The Living Christ,* pp. 105 f. [6] *DB,* 1647.

of the two principles set forth by Pope Pius IX manifests itself as a development of the great Sovereign Pontiff's assertion that "the dogmas of the Catholic faith are in no way opposed to the divine mercy and justice."[7]

3) Father Murphy seriously weakens and confuses his explanation by speaking sometimes of "the necessity of belonging to the Church" and sometimes of "the necessity of membership in the Church." He makes the assertion that "While the axiom, 'Outside the Church there is no salvation,' undoubtedly refers to actual membership in the visible Church, there is still a deeper meaning involved in that statement."[8]

There would seem to be very little excuse for imagining or for leading the Catholic reading public to imagine that the axiom of no salvation outside the Church *undoubtedly* refers to actual membership in the visible Church. There is no statement of the ecclesiastical *magisterium* to the effect that actual membership in the Church is requisite for the attainment of eternal salvation. The Fourth Lateran Council designates the Church as that "outside of which no one at all (*nullus omnino*) is saved."[9] The *Unam sanctam* of Pope Boniface VIII speaks of it as that "outside of which there is neither salvation nor the remission of sins."[10] The most forceful and arresting of all the older authoritative statements of this dogma, that made by the Council of Florence in its Decree for the Jacobites, asserts that those "intra catholicam Ecclesiam non exsistentes" will go into everlasting fire "nisi ante finem vitae eidem [Ecclesiae] fuerint aggregati."[11] The *Humani generis* mentions the "necessitatem pertinendi ad veram Ecclesiam, ut sempiterna attingatur salus."[12] In no case is there any reference to a necessity of actual membership in the true Church.

The *Suprema haec sacra* is quite explicit on this point. "Quandoquidem ut quis aeternam obtineat salutem, non semper exigitur ut *reapse* Ecclesiae tamquam membrum incorporetur, sed id saltem requiritur, ut eidem *voto* et *desiderio* adhaereat."[13] In other words, according to this authoritative instruction issued by the Holy Office at the command of the Holy Father himself, the dogma

[7] *DB*, 1646.
[8] *The Living Christ*, p. 116.
[9] *DB*, 430.
[10] *DB*, 468.
[11] *DB*, 714.
[12] *DB*, 3019.
[13] *AER*, CXXVII, 4 (Oct., 1952), 308.

that there is no salvation outside the Church definitely does not mean that a man has to be an actual member of the Church in order to be saved.

Father Murphy's book was written some months before the publication of the entire text of the *Suprema haec sacra.* It is unfortunate, however, that the ablest of the recent books dealing with the Church's necessity for salvation should contain any teaching not in accord with the doctrine set forth in that instruction from the Holy Office. The ecclesiastical *magisterium,* which recognized and venerated as Saints men who had suffered martyrdom without having had an opportunity to be baptized and thus to achieve actual membership in the Church, definitely should not be represented to our people as teaching that actual membership in the Church is necessary for salvation.

4) In *The Living Christ,* two diverse and mutually incompatible explanations of the dogma are represented as differing only in a relatively unimportant matter of terminology. We are told that "Whether one wishes to interpret the axiom ['Outside the Church there is no salvation'] as referring only to actual membership and consider others outside the Church as divinely intended 'exceptions'; or whether one wishes to interpret it as meaning 'outside either actual membership in the Church, or an implicit or explicit desire for membership there is no salvation,' it tells us the same thing. The terms are really a subtle question for theologians to debate."[14]

The author of *The Living Christ* makes it quite clear that he prefers to interpret the statement that there is no salvation outside the Church in terms of membership in the Church rather than in terms of either membership or a desire for membership. He states that some have "explained the axiom as saying that unless one were a member of the Church either actually or in desire, there is no salvation."[15] But, according to him, "This interpretation does seem to force the meaning of the axiom itself, which seem always to have indicated the ideal plan of God's economy; and also, the very term 'member in desire' is liable to the criticism of being bad English and clumsy theology."[16]

[14] *The Living Christ,* p. 117.
[15] *Ibid.,* p. 116.
[16] *Ibid.*

Father Murphy's strictures against the use of the expression "member in desire" are quite justified in the case of those men who would speak in such a way as to give the impression that a member in desire was one kind of member of the Church, with a membership in some way distinct from that of a member *in re*. Such a procedure is definitely bad English and clumsy theology. When, on the other hand, we say that a man can attain eternal salvation as a member of the true Church or as one who desires to belong to it, we are simply repeating the teaching of the *Suprema haec sacra* itself. This teaching does not "force" the meaning of the axiom "Outside the Church there is no salvation" in any way. It is, on the contrary, a part of the Church's own interpretation of the dogma of which the axiom itself is the expression.

If, however, we choose to interpret this axiom as referring only to actual membership in the Church, considering others outside the Church as divinely intended "exceptions," we are offering an explanation of the dogma and of the axiom quite incompatible with the explicit statements of the ecclesiastical *magisterium*. The axiom, in the last analysis, is nothing more or less than the common and popular statement of a dogma which the *ecclesia docens* has set forth and has explained many times. The statements of the *magisterium* with regard to the Church's necessity for salvation are always unrestricted and universal. Thus the *magisterium* tells us that *no one at all* (nullus omnino) is saved outside the Church and that *none of those who are not within the Catholic Church* (nullos intra catholicam Ecclesiam non exsistentes) can become partakers of eternal life. Statements like these do not admit of exceptions. If there are individuals who attain eternal salvation outside the Catholic Church, according to the way in which the *magisterium* itself interprets the meaning of the word "outside" in this context, then these declarations of the *ecclesia docens* are simply not true.

Thus the two explanations of the axiom which Father Murphy offers as at least practically equivalent are, in point of fact, disparate and mutually incompatible. One turns out to be a statement of the Church's own teaching. The other involves an opposition to authoritative declarations of the Church's *magisterium*. The fact that the great Cardinal Newman himself taught that

the dogma of the Church's necessity for salvation admitted of exceptions in no way justifies the employment of this device.[17]

5) Father Murphy has weakened his explanation of the dogma by use of the term "ideal." We are told that "Here we have the statement of the *ideal:* that every single man in the New Testament era should become an actual member of this visible Church established by Christ, and through her receive the graces of Redemption. Yet God knew from all eternity that there would actually be men who would not become members of this Church through no fault of their own."[18] Again, we are told that "Looked at in this way, the axiom may be understood as referring to the *ideal* plan of providence; it is the rule and not the exception. Those who are saved outside the Church are the exceptions . . ."[19] Furthermore, he states that "It is the order primarily desired by God, the rule that He lays down, that all should be saved within the Church. In establishing this general rule, however, God did not fail to provide for those whom we may call the exceptions."[20]

Thus we see the practical equivalence, for Father Murphy's explanation of the dogma, of being actually a member of the Church, and being "within" the Church. This is not in accord with the teaching of the *magisterium.* Likewise, there is a tendency to see in the axiom merely a statement of an antecedent decree of the divine will. The body of authoritative teaching of which this axiom is the commonly employed expression, however, bears no such interpretation. All of these claim to be statements of actual fact. They are intended as expressions of the consequent will of God. They mean, according to the *Suprema haec sacra,* that the Church is necessary for salvation with the necessity of means as well as with the necessity of precept. The Church is not merely an entity which was necessary for all according to an antecedent decree of the divine will. It is a society, the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, outside of which actually no one at all can be saved.

Father Trese's approach to this teaching is somewhat different from that of Father Murphy. He seeks, in the best sense of the

[17] Cf. *Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1896), II, 336.

[18] *The Living Christ,* p. 106.

[19] *Ibid.,* p. 107.

[20] *Ibid.*

term, to popularize Catholic teaching. He writes simply and incisively, to explain the fundamentals of our doctrine.

Yet it is by reason of this very tendency towards simplicity that *Wisdom Shall Enter* presents a somewhat undesirable explanation of the Church's necessity for salvation. "These then," Father Trese tells us, "are the ones of whom it is true to say that, 'Outside the Church there is no salvation': the Catholic who already has the faith and cannot lose it except through his own fault; and the non-Catholic who knows, or at least suspects, that the Catholic Church is Christ's own."[21]

Wisdom Shall Enter was published long after the publication of the full text of the *Suprema haec sacra.* In this authoritative letter of the Holy Office, sent at the command of the Holy Father himself, we read: "Neque enim in praecepto tantummodo dedit Salvator ut omnes homines intrarent Ecclesiam, sed statuit quoque Ecclesiam medium esse salutis, sine quo nemo intrare valeat regnum gloriae caelestis."[22] This is part of the Church's own explanation of the dogma that there is no salvation outside the Church. Hence people are seriously misled if they are persuaded to believe that this dogma applies only to Catholics and to those non-Catholics who know or suspect that the Catholic Church is the true Church of Jesus Christ. Yet this is precisely the impression that is gained from a declaration that these are *the ones* to whom the dogma applies.

Father Trese, it is true, teaches that the state of mind of a Protestant (or a Jew or a Mohammedan) who is sincerely convinced that his religion is the true religion, and who lives up to his religion to the very best of his ability is this: "I want to do everything that God asks of me, no matter what."[23] He does not, however, connect this teaching with the dogma that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church.

He terminates his own explanation of this subject with the following paragraph.

> But this fact still remains: Christ's own Way of Salvation is bound to be the best, the surest, the safest way. There are good Protestants, and there are bad Catholics. But in no other church

---

[21] *Wisdom Shall Enter,* p. 142.
[22] *AER,* CXXVII, 4 (Oct., 1952), 308.
[23] *Wisdom Shall Enter,* p. 143.

can personal sanctity reach such heights as in Christ's own Church; in no other church will goodness be so widespread, nor salvation so certain. With all the helps which Christ has entrusted to His Church—the Mass, the Sacraments, the fulness of Truth—the "good Catholic" has an advantage over the "good non-Catholic" beyond all compute.[24]

It would be difficult to find a defense of the Catholic Church elaborated more completely in terms of distinctly Protestant ecclesiology. The Catholic Church is presented, not as the Mystical Body of Christ, actually requisite for all men, but merely as the best of the religious organizations available to men. Indeed, the paragraph seems to imply that there is some way of salvation available other than through Our Lord. It is painful to realize that some Catholic people will be led to imagine that a statement like the first sentence of the paragraph cited above is an accurate expression of genuine Catholic doctrine.

In point of fact, the Catholic Church does not present itself merely as the best or the most effective religious society on earth. It is the Mystical Body of Christ, the only religious society objectively approved by and acceptable to God Himself. It is the one kingdom of God on earth, the true *ecclesia* of Jesus Christ.

According to the original Protestant theory of ecclesiology, on the other hand, the kingdom of God, the *ecclesia* of the Scriptures, is not an organized society at all. It depicts this true *ecclesia* as an *invisible* church, as the sum-total of all the good people or the predestined people on earth. In the light of this erroneous theory, the visible churches, the organized societies into which men who wish to follow Our Lord are organized, play a distinctly subsidiary part. If the Gospel is preached sincerely and sacraments administered rightly within these organizations, they appear as more or less acceptable and useful aids for people who are supposed to be joined to Our Lord in the invisible church.

No proponent of this theory ever held that all religious denominations are equally good. Quite on the contrary, an organization was supposed to be more acceptable or more useful than others if it could offer more effective spiritual guidance and help to its members. Naturally, each denomination would claim a high degree of excellence for itself, while, at the same time, it held, according to this same general theory, that other religious societies which

[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 143 f.

passed muster under the Protestant notes of the church were legitimate and really, though perhaps in a lesser degree, effective.

The theory itself is hopelessly erroneous because the Mystical Body of Christ actually is the visible Catholic Church. The religious society over which the Bishop of Rome presides as Our Lord's Vicar on earth is the one and only social unit within which men may achieve salvific contact with God in Christ.

Yet, in this final paragraph of *Wisdom Shall Enter,* we find the Catholic Church presented in the light of this theory. "Christ's own Way of Salvation" is designated as the best, the surest and the safest, but definitely not as the only way. There are other "churches" in which salvation itself will be found, even though not as certainly as in the Catholic Church.

Such teaching is not in conformity with the declarations of the Church's *magisterium.* Thus, to cite only one example, in the *Singulari quadam,* the great allocution which Pope Pius IX delivered on the day following his definition of the dogma of Our Lady's Immaculate Conception, the Holy Father said that it was his duty to admonish the Bishops who were listening to him to do all in their power "to drive out of men's minds that equally impious and deadly opinion according to which the way of eternal salvation can be found in any religion."[25] That error is present even when the way of salvation is represented as available in other religions less perfectly or less certainly than in the Catholic Church.

Those who will benefit from reading *Wisdom Shall Enter* will be benefited far more if, in future printings of this work, the part on the necessity of the Church for salvation is revised in line with the pertinent statements and explanations of the ecclesiastical *magisterium.*

Joseph Clifford Fenton

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[25] *DB,* 1646.

Answers to Questions

ATTENDANCE AT MOTION PICTURES

Question: In the periodical *Cross Currents* (Fall number, 1953) Mr. Erwin W. Geisman, defending the "intellectual" Catholic and denouncing the "simplist," wrote as follows:

> Just recently a Catholic priest wrote the following as part of a plea for economic sanctions against recalcitrant motion picture exhibitors: "As Catholics, we know that it would be a sin to attend any motion picture that has received the condemnation of the National Legion of Decency, because we would thereby place ourselves in a proximate occasion of sin" (*Brooklyn Tablet,* Nov. 21, 1953, p. 6). If this is only an isolated case of appalling ignorance it would be a good example of the simplist mind. But the unpleasant suspicion lurks that there may be Catholic seminaries actually teaching such nonsense.

What comment could be given by a Catholic priest to Catholics like Mr. Geisman who claim to be "intellectuals" and condemn as nonsense such statements as that quoted above, made by a priest in the *Brooklyn Tablet*?

Answer: Mr. Geisman and the "intellectuals" who favor his views should be assured that what he calls nonsense is taught and will continue to be taught in Catholic seminaries, because it is the application to a particular problem of the approved Catholic doctrine on the frequentation of the occasions of sin and of scandal. This so-called "nonsense" is based on directives of the Popes. Thus, Pope Pius XI, in his Encyclical on motion pictures to the Bishops of the United States (June 29, 1936) gives high praise to the Legion of Decency and commends those Catholics who sign the pledge of the Legion of Decency. Pope Pius XII more recently (Jan. 1, 1954) comments on the evil of obscene television shows and refers to the "painful spectacle of the power for evil and moral ruin of cinema films."

Of course, if Mr. Geisman and the "intellectuals" regard the Popes also as "simplists," these arguments will have little weight. But these arguments will appeal to truly intelligent Catholics who respect and obey the directions of the Pope as the admonitions of

Christ Himself, and whose honesty and common sense lead them to believe that most persons, whether highly intelligent or grossly stupid, who choose to attend salacious motion pictures are motivated, not by the artistic or aesthetic urge, but by the desire of sexual thrill.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE IMPRIMATUR

Question: I have seen this statement in a book bearing the *Nihil obstat* of a diocesan censor and the *Imprimatur* of the Ordinary: "The *Nihil obstat* and the *Imprimatur* are official declarations that a book or pamphlet is free of doctrinal or moral error. No implication is contained therein that those who have granted the *Nihil obstat* and *Imprimatur* agree with the contents, opinions or statements expressed." Is there not a contradiction between the first and the second sentences of this declaration?

Answer: There is no contradiction between these two sentences. The meaning is that, while the orthodoxy of the matter contained in the book or pamphlet is guaranteed, neither the *censor deputatus* nor the Ordinary must necessarily be regarded as agreeing with views which the author may express *within the scope of opinions compatible with faith and morals.* Thus, if the theme of a theological book is the defense of the Thomistic system on grace, the *Nihil obstat* and the *Imprimatur* are no indication that the censor and the Ordinary accept this system in preference to Molinism.

SACRAMENTAL PENANCES

Question 1: May a confessor impose as a penance a merely internal work of devotion, such as meditation on the Passion of Our Lord for half an hour?

Question 2: May a penance be imposed on condition of a future lapse into sin—for example: "Your penance will be the recitation of a Hail Mary every time you take the name of the Lord in vain"?

Question 3: May a perpetual penance be imposed—for example, the recitation of the rosary every day for the rest of the penitent's lifetime?

Answer 1: Some of the older theologians taught that the fulfillment of the penance imposed by the confessor, since it is an integral part of the sacrament (a sensible sign), must be an external act. However, it is now commonly taught that even an internal act, such as meditation, may be imposed as a penance by the confessor. For such an act is externalized inasmuch as the imposing of the act by the confessor and the acceptance by the penitent are external. Hence, while the confessor is advised to choose some external action as the sacramental penance, he has no reason to doubt the validity of the sacrament if he decides to impose a merely internal act of devotion (Cf. S. Alphonsus, *Theologia moralis,* VI, n. 514).

Answer 2: Again, some theologians have doubted the right of the confessor to give a penance that is conditioned on the future relapses of the penitent. For, they point out, in this event there may actually be no sacramental satisfaction fulfilled—namely, if the penitent avoids relapsing into sin. But to this objection the answer is that even in this supposition the penitent performs a good deed of self-denial in the effort which he makes to avoid the sin in question (Cf. Cappello, *De sacramentis* [Rome, 1943], II, n. 245).

Answer 3: Theoretically, a confessor may impose a penance that will bind the penitent permanently—for example, to abstain from smoking the rest of his life. But, according to St. Alphonsus, in practice such penances are very imprudent and should never be imposed. One reason is the fact that the penitent is likely to neglect such a penance with the passing of time and thus be guilty of sin (*Homo apostolicus,* tract. 16, n. 52).

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

SHORTAGE OF SACRED PARTICLES

Question: Recently at my mission church I forgot to consecrate a sufficient number of small particles for distribution of Holy Communion. I did not want to divide the small Hosts so I took part of the large Host that I consecrated for my Mass. Now some of my fellow priests tell me that I acted incorrectly. *Quid de hoc?*

Answer: "Only in case of absolute necessity (e.g. to give Holy

Viaticum, when no other Sacred Particle is available) may be give a part broken from the Host of his own Mass" (O'Connell, *Celebration of Mass*). The law is very clear in this regard. The Sacred Congregation permits that in case of necessity the priest break the Sacred Particles and give a part to each person approaching the altar rail. Normally, the small particles should not be broken into more than two parts. We are further instructed that the broken part which is given in Holy Communion must be large enough to be swallowed, and not so small that it will dissolve in the mouth of the communicant before being swallowed.

RECITATION OF PRAYERS AT HOLY COMMUNION

Question: It strikes me that some priests do not recite the entire prayer required at the distribution of Holy Communion, judging from the speed of their actions. Are we permitted at any time to shorten this prayer?

Answer: We are instructed by all rubricians to make the sign of the cross with each consecrated Host, over and within the limits of the ciborium or paten and saying the complete prayer, *Corpus Domini nostri Jesus Christi, etc.* and ending with *Amen.* At no time are we allowed to omit any of this formula or make any short cuts for ourself because of the large number of communicants or tired feeling of the priest.

EPIPHANY HOLY WATER

Question: I am told that the ritual for blessing water on the Vigil of Epiphany has been changed from that in the Roman Ritual. What form is presently in use?

Answer: In the very latest edition of the Roman Ritual published in the Eternal City we find this blessing with no change whatsoever from previous editions. What may have confused our inquirer is the fact that this blessing is reserved to the Bishop who may in turn delegate it to priests. It is interesting to note that the custom of blessing Epiphany water is Oriental in origin and while the ceremony was found in some European rituals, particularly in Germany, yet it was not officially included in the Roman Ritual until Dec. 6, 1890.

Father Weller has this interesting footnote about the custom. "The Eastern Church has long emphasized in its celebration of Epiphany the Mystery of our Lord's baptism in the Jordan, and by analogy our baptism. Albeit the mind of the Western Church has not neglected this aspect, as the texts of the feast demonstrate, in practice Western Catholics have concentrated on the Mystery of the Magi."

GOLDEN WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

Question: A couple in my parish are celebrating their golden wedding anniversary and I am anxious to know if there is any special ceremony for such an occasion.

Answer: While there is no official or prescribed ceremony in the Ritual for this particular occasion, we do find in standard rituals and books of ceremonies indication of customs that have been more or less accepted in this country. Fr. Philip T. Weller in his Ritual of three volumes outlines in detail the ceremony for a golden or silver wedding anniversary. Likewise, the latest edition of the Roman Ritual published by Benziger Brothers in its supplementary section gives in detail what the priest may do on such an occasion. In any event the ceremony is independent of the Mass. However, it is praiseworthy that Holy Mass follow the ceremony.

KYRIE AT SUNG MASS

Question: When does the celebrant start the *Kyrie* at (a) a solemn High Mass? (b) a solemn Requiem High Mass? Does he start the *Kyrie* on the epistle side at the book, or at the center of the altar?

Answer: Rubricians direct that the celebrant at a Solemn High Mass or at a Solemn Requiem High Mass recite the *Kyrie* at the epistle corner after he has finished the introit and before going to the center of the altar to intone the *Gloria* or sing the *Dominus vobiscum.*

STATUE OF BEATUS

Question: Is there any legislation forbidding the erection in a church of a statue of a beatified person who has not yet been canonized?

Answer: Canon Law states that we pay the honor of public worship only to Saints beatified or canonized by the Church. Beatification does not entitle to the same honors as canonization but to the *beatus* we pay honor with certain restrictions. Canon Mahoney says that "there is no difference in kind between the cultus shown towards a beatified and a canonized saint; the difference is one of degree, it being restricted in the case of the beatified, to certain acts and certain places." So there is no problem in erecting a statue of a beatified person, e.g., Pope Pius X, whose canonization may take place in May of this year.

DISPLAY OF FLAGS

Question: What is the correct order for displaying both the national and papal flag in church?

Answer: Rubricians give no directions about the placement of flags in the church. The regulations issued by our government state that the American flag should be on the Gospel side when placed in the sanctuary and the papal flag in a corresponding position on the epistle side. If they are displayed outside of the communion railing the positions are reversed. In processions the American flag is carried on the right of the papal flag.

BAPTISTERY PROBLEM

Question: It seems proper when baptizing a person to let the water run off the forehead into the baptismal font. Now, if the parish's total supply of baptismal water was kept in the font, which has only one basin, is it still proper to let the water used in the baptism run off into the total supply and thus be used again? Or must unused, wholly so, water be used for each new baptism?

Answer: We are instructed to use baptismal water, water especially blessed for that purpose, when we are administering the sacrament of baptism. If the baptismal water drains back into the ordinary supply of water as explained by our inquirer there seems to be nothing that would make the sacrament invalid. However, it is a question of sanitation, plus making the reception of this sacrament as attractive as possible to people. Furthermore, grant that the supply does run low, one can always add water to the baptismal water provided that this additional amount does not exceed by more than one half what already is present. Again, if the construction of the baptismal font is such that there is only one basin and that contains the baptismal water, why not purchase a suitable bowl into which the used baptismal water can flow?

BENEDICTION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

Question: We have Rosary and Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament every day at our parish church. Is it allowed to have the Rosary *coram Sanctissimo* on Sundays and big feasts, that is between the *O salutaris* and *Tantum ergo?* Please indicate the reference of your answer.

Answer: "The incensing is required after the exposition. One may then recite or sing prayers in the vulgar tongue (the beads, canticles, the act of atonement, litanies, etc.)" (Durieux-Dolphin, *The Eucharist, Law and Practice*). From this it is clear that the prayers can be said on any day and not only on Sunday or big feasts.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Analecta

Recent issues of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* contain the notices of several important appointments.

May 29, 1953, Most Rev. Francis Green was appointed titular Bishop of Serra and auxiliary to Most Rev. Daniel J. Gercke, Bishop of Tucson.[1]

July 11, 1953, Most Rev. John J. Krol was appointed titular Bishop of Cadi and auxiliary to Most Rev. Edward F. Hoban, Archbishop-Bishop of Cleveland.[2]

July 21, 1953, Most Rev. Albert G. Meyer, Bishop of Superior, was appointed Archbishop of Milwaukee.[3]

Aug. 6, 1953, Most Rev. Henry J. O'Brien, Bishop of Hartford was appointed Archbishop of Hartford.[4]

Aug. 19, 1953, Most Rev. Bryan J. McEntegart, Bishop of Ogdensburg and Rector of the Catholic University of America, was appointed to the titular see of Aradi.[5]

Aug. 25, 1953, Most Rev. Edward V. Dargin was appointed titular Bishop of Amphipolis and auxiliary to His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York.[6]

On that same date, Most Rev. Walter P. Kellenberg was appointed titular Bishop of Janina and auxiliary to His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York.[7]

Likewise on that date, Most Rev. Coleman F. Carroll was appointed titular Bishop of Pitane and auxiliary to Most Rev. John F. Dearden, Bishop of Pittsburgh.[8]

On that date, too, Most Rev. Lawrence J. Shehan, titular Bishop of Lydda, was appointed Bishop of Bridgeport.[9]

Sept. 1, 1953, Most Rev. Bernard J. Flanagan was appointed Bishop of Norwich.[10]

Nov. 3, 1953, Most Rev. Raymond P. Hillinger was appointed Bishop of Rockford.[11]

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XLV (1953), 465.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 466.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 560.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 759.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 560.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 561.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 561.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 561.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 759.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 759.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 760.

During this same period the Secretariate of State announced many appointments:[12]

Protonotary Apostolic ad instar participantium:

Jan. 20, 1953, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Vitus S. Graffeo and William F. O'Brien of the Diocese of Dallas.

Feb. 27, 1953, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward J. Smith of the Diocese of Sioux City.

April 10, 1953, Rt. Rev. Msgr. James B. O'Reilly of the Archdiocese of New York.

April 16, 1953, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Richard O'Brien of the Diocese of Buffalo.

May 11, 1953, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John J. Lannon, Clarence Mullen, William A. Oberste, of the Diocese of Corpus Christi.

Oct. 11, 1953, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John Casey, John Maguire, Francis X. Shea, of the Archdiocese of New York.

Oct. 15, 1953, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John Campbell, Theodore Czastka, Walter Fasnacht, Gerald Kealy, Richard Kelly, Robert Maguire, Patrick McGuire, John Mielcarek, George Parker, of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

Domestic Prelates:

Oct. 14, 1949, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Michael Coghlan, Frederick Schwertz, of the Diocese of Wheeling.

Feb. 10, 1953, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Theophile Caudron, E. Vander Grinten, Raymond Harkin, Bernard Hulshof, Victor J. Reed, of the Diocese of Oklahoma and Tulsa.

Feb. 27, 1953, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Francis X. Singleton, of the Diocese of Monterey-Fresno; Percy P. Gearen, Frank H. Greteman, William F. Mason, Edward L. McEvoy, Francis P. Schultes, of the Diocese of Sioux City.

April 8, 1953, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Joseph Irwin and Eugene Stout of the Diocese of Wilmington.

April 10, 1953, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Augustine Asfalg, John Dougherty, Domenico Fiorentino, Emil Komora, John McCahill, John McClafferty, George McWeeney, John Reilly, Lafayette Yarwood, of the Archdiocese of New York; Daniel Bernard, Gustave Berube, George Bodin, Irving De Blanc, Henry Hamel, of the Diocese of Lafayette.

April 21, 1953, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Kevin A. Dunne, Edward Miller, Harold Palmer, Albert Schmitt, of the Diocese of Corpus Christi; Joseph Gosselin, William Vaughan, of the Diocese of Salt Lake City.

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 472 ff., 518 ff., 700 ff., 822 ff.

April 23, 1953, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Leo F. Miller, of the Diocese of Toledo.

May 11, 1953, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Joseph Brandley, Francis Keenan, John Lynch, Arthur Lyons, Daniel T. McColgan, Henry O'Connell, Henry O'Connor, of the Archdiocese of Boston.

June 24, 1953, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Howard Smith, of the Diocese of Fargo.

Sept. 26, 1953, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Bernard Kearns, Albert Matyn, John Ryan, of the Archdiocese of Detroit; Thomas Lehane, John Purcell, Kenneth Stack, Matthew Thompson, John van Veggel, of the Diocese of San Diego; Leo C. Byrne, Francis Dieckmann, William M. Drumm, Mark Ebner, Charleville B. Faris, James Johnston, William F. Mullally, Edward L. O'Toole, Frederick Sprenke, Henry E. Stitz, Alois Stumpf, Lloyd A. Sullivan, of the Archdiocese of St. Louis.

Oct. 11, 1953, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John Delaney, Emil Di Matteo, William Jordan, Joseph Kerwin, Michael McGuire, Joseph O'Connell, Patrick O'Leary, of the Archdiocese of New York.

Oct. 15, 1953, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. George Beemsterboer, Valentine Belinski, Matthew Canning, John Collins, Walter Croarkin, Matthew Cummings, Joseph Cussen, Francis Dolan, James Duffin, Francis Flaherty, Lawrence Frawley, Henry Friel, Joseph Garrity, James Gleeson, Patrick Gleeson, William Gorman, George Heimsath, Raymond Hillinger, Ernest Horvath, Felix Kachnowski, Boleslaus Kasprzycki, Edward Kelly, Martin Krizka, James Lawler, John McCarthy, Joseph McGowan, John McMahon, Eugene Mulcahey, James Murphy, Martin Muzik, William O'Brien, William Owens, Gerard Picard, Ernest Primeau, Thomas Reed, William Rooney, John Schmid, Edward Smaza, John Sprengel, John Sugrue, Arthur Terlecke, James Walsh, George Wunder, of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

Secret Chamberlains Supernumerary:

Jan. 28, 1953, V. Rev. Msgrs. Nicholas Babak, Joseph Batza, Demetrius Gresko, Joseph Schmondiuk, John Stock, of the Apostolic Exarchate for the Ruthenian faithful of Byzantine Rite of Galicia in the United States.

Feb. 10, 1953, V. Rev. Msgrs. Adam A. Isenbart and Sylvester Luecke, of the Diocese of Oklahoma and Tulsa.

Feb. 27, 1953, V. Rev. Msgrs. Daniel E. Sheehan, of the Archdiocese of Omaha; William B. Bauer, of the Diocese of Sioux City.

March 3, 1953, V. Rev. Msgrs. Edward V. Vollmer, of the Diocese of Sioux City; Joseph McGlynn, of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

April 10, 1953, V. Rev. Msgrs. Thomas J. Rilley, of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia; Charles A. Brady, of the Archdiocese of New York; Warren L. Boudreaux and Ignatius Martin, of the Diocese of Lafayette.

April 17, 1953, V. Rev. Msgr. Henry Lenahan, of the Archdiocese of New York.

April 23, 1953, V. Rev. Msgrs. Maurice A. Hofer, of the Diocese of Covington; George Undreiner, of the Archdiocese of San Antonio.

May 11, 1953, V. Rev. Msgrs. John P. Carroll, Philip Kearney, Edward McDonough, Arthur Riley, Francis Rossiter, Edward Sweeney, of the Archdiocese of Boston.

Sept. 26, 1953, V. Rev. Msgr. Joseph Breitenbeck, of the Archdiocese of Detroit.

Oct. 12, 1953, V. Rev. Msgr. Raymond Etteldorf, of the Archdiocese of Dubuque.

Oct. 15, 1953, V. Rev. Msgrs. Edward Dailey, Thomas Fitzgerald, Thomas Grady, George Higgins, John Houlihan, Francis Lavin, Francis McElligott, Thomas Meehan, Damasus Mozeris, Cletus O'Donnell, Stanislaus Piwowar, Aloysius Wycislo, Raymond Zock, of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

Secret Chamberlain in Cape and Sword, supernumerary:

May 26, 1953, Mr. Oscar Halecki, of the Archdiocese of New York.

Plaque of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:

April 24, 1953, Mr. Terence Cosgrove, of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

May 22, 1953, Mr. Thomas Bradley, of the Archdiocese of New York.

Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:

Jan. 26, 1953, Messrs. Cyril A. Coyle, Henry J. Devine, Peter E. Mitchell, of the Diocese of Sacramento.

March 25, 1953, Mr. Edward F. Gallagher, of the Abbey *nullius* of Mary, Help of Christians, Belmont, N. C.

May 27, 1953, Mr. Hugh Taylor, of the Diocese of Trenton.

Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:

Jan. 7, 1953, Mr. Ellis J. Louie, of the Diocese of Sacramento.

Jan. 26, 1953, Messrs. Luigi Gaberino and Giacomo Pezzetti, of the Diocese of Oklahoma and Tulsa.

April 10, 1953, Messrs. Anthony Abdalla, Rendall U. Abshire, John B. Aycock, Ernest A. Boudreaux, Alcide L. Broussard, Wilmore Broussard Sr., Wilmore J. Brulet, John Connolly, Howard J.

Cornay, Matthias Fruge, Voorhies L. Gassie, Charles Ibert, James Landry, Lawrence Larcade, Frank Lipari, Patrick Maraist, Murry Martin, Robert Motty, Andrew Osterland, Albert Peck, Arthur Provost, Joseph Riehl, George J. Sabatier, Aurelius Stelly, of the Diocese of Lafayette.

May 2, 1953, Mr. George Deck, of the Diocese of Buffalo.

Sept. 28, 1953, Messrs. Edward P. Buddy, Edmund L. Haas, George E. Henegan, Leo J. Wieck, of the Archdiocese of St. Louis.

Oct. 13, 1953, Messrs. Rudolph Berger, Cushman Bissell, Frank Brodnicki, James Callahan, Joseph Cavanaugh, Mark Cronin, Walter Cummings, Matthew Fitzgerald, Paul Galvin, Russell Leander, Joseph Merrion, James Mulcahey, Herbert Nash, John Nering, Daniel Ryan, Herbert Schmitz, John Sheehan, John Svetina, John Walz, of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

Oct. 14, 1953, Mr. Paul Camilletti, of the Diocese of Wheeling.

Oct. 16, 1953, Mr. William P. McGervey, of the Diocese of San Diego.

Commander of the Order of Pope St. Sylvester:

April 20, 1953, Mr. Charles B. Lanman, of the Diocese of Steubenville.

May 20, 1953, Mr. Luigi Raggi, of the Archdiocese of Newark.

June 19, 1953, Mr. Anthony Izzo, of the Archdiocese of Washington.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Book Reviews

THE CASE OF CARDINAL ALOYSIUS STEPINAC. By Richard Pattee. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1953. Pp. xvi+499. $5.50.

Two books in one might be an apt description of Pattee's painstaking work on Cardinal Stepinac. One, the book proper, summarizes the case of His Eminence, then His Grace the Archbishop, before his atheistic accusers, minions of the Communist Tito whose real ties with Moscow again are becoming evident since his personal feud with the late Josef Stalin. This first section, entitled "Analysis," covers succinctly the essence of the fraudulent case against the Archbishop of Zagreb, placing it in a proper and quite illuminating setting of Croatian and Serbian history, at first glance formidable, but of course needed to grasp some meaning from the whole story. It is skillfully done, though one might wish for a table with dates and events, and especially an outline map of the chief places mentioned—most of us are that ignorant, it may be ventured, regarding the *Antemurale Christianitatis,* a Pope's grateful sobriquet for Croatia.

Moving very swiftly through the analysis—it is accomplished in 152 pages—the mature reader will face the even more satisfying second section, "book" if you will, labeled "Documents." Documents there are indeed, running to more than seventy-five if you include the lengthy addresses of the public prosecutor, the attorneys for the defense of the Archbishop, and His Grace's own stirring, thrilling statement in his own defense. This extensive second section (pp. 155-497) is terminated by a kind of postscript, spanning the time from December, 1945, Stepinac's last document printed, in one jump to September, 1952, which is the dignified, factual and very convincing letter of the Yugoslav Bishops to Marshal Tito.

As a case-history of a *cause célèbre* Pattee has indeed rendered a much-wanted service to English-speaking Catholics and Christians all over the world, in fact to all fair-minded men. Newspaper articles, reports, editorials, are so easily lost sight of, mislaid, clipped maybe and forgotten. Here the serious reader finds the whole case in consecutive form. It deals directly with the Archibshop of course, yet in a larger sense lifts the veil called Iron for its secrecy from so much of what happens at a Communist frame-up, unjustly dignified glibly by the honorable name of "trial."

Even for the busy Catholic clergyman, professor, teacher, writer, there is much to be learned as to Communist methods. For the question not unnaturally arises in many minds: how could such a thing happen? Any reader will find the clear, clean answer to this question in the documents. The sceptical who are not even schooled in the elements of Communist trickery and deceit will soon have the scales fall from their eyes: law as a means of wiping out conscientious, religious-minded men, good deeds curdled into bad, courts as an instrument of dictatorial power, works of mercy turned wrongside out into conspiracy, public power as a club with which to beat one's patriotic countrymen. Incredible as all this seems to many Americans, even perhaps some Catholics, the documents speak for themselves and will be an orientation as to how one should and must view so-called "justice" in Communist lands—benign interpretation here only adds up to infantile gullibility.

To read these documents in order of date as Pattee sets them down is in itself the kind of education in Marxist tactics and strategy so painfully lacking in otherwise well-informed men and women, not only in this country, but all over the world. One cannot help but be convinced that the author has done much to raise us out of the kindergarten level or grade-school mentality as regards practical atheistic Communism to something approaching a realistically grown-up grasp of what God-fearing men everywhere are facing in our modern world. Charges framed so plausibly, press notices so cleverly slanted, suppressions at just the right places, friends high-placed in the precise countries where influence is needed, seeds of suspicion sown in carefully furrowed friends of liberty—can any of us forget how this did affect well-meaning persons, perhaps even some Catholics, among those who would have no real truck with Communists?

Even Mindszenty found his attackers among us, and later Beran, now Wyszynski—if not attackers at least those who silently sit by and just dumbly wonder. Pattee has here pulverized all the sham in the case of Stepinac. He has made it plain that were freedom of research and reporting open to the Western world, not a shadow of doubt could possibly remain regarding the innocence of those others who have fallen into the atheist toils. No wonder Yugoslav customs' officials, it is said, ferret out this book at the border.

Names change, the method remains fundamentally constant. Pattee makes that method so self-evident that we owe him a debt of heartfelt gratitude. The work sets up a criterion invaluable in assessing how and why the Reds perform.

JOHN L. BAZINET

INDULGENCES, THE ORDINARY POWER OF PRELATES INFERIOR TO THE POPE TO GRANT INDULGENCES. By Joseph Edward Campbell. Universitas Ottaviensis. Series Canonica, Tomus 19. Ottawa: The University of Ottawa Press, 1953. Pp. xiv+199. $4.00.

The present work is a doctoral dissertation in the field of Canon Law, written at the Catholic University of Ottawa. The subject matter is presented in three parts, namely preliminary notions (pp. 3-50), historical synopsis (pp. 53-115) and canonical commentary (pp. 119-175), after which follow the author's conclusions, the bibliography and an alphabetical index.

In the first part the writer gives a general exposition of the subject of indulgences. Taking the statement of canon 911 as his point of departure he explains briefly and with commendable clarity such things as the nature, kinds and sources of indulgences, the supreme jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff over the distribution of indulgences, the manner in which indulgences are granted, and other cognate matters.

In the historical synopsis a general picture of the granting of indulgences during the long history of the Church is delineated. The author finds the use of indulgences existing in Apostolic times and traces its development to the third century when the Church granted indulgences to repentant sinners at the request of the martyrs and in view of the satisfaction which by their martyrdom they had offered to God for sin. Between the third and the eleventh century, when at the Council of Clermont (1095) Pope Urban II granted a plenary indulgence to those who joined the crusades to free the Holy Land, there are no clear records of the Church using the power of granting indulgences. During the interim the canonical penances of the system of public penance and the penances of the *penitentials* seem to have eclipsed, if not altogether to have displaced, the use of indulgences. However, the author examines the evolution of the penitential system and reveals how it prepared the way for the method by which partial indulgences are granted today.

This method was not inaugurated until 1116, when Pope Pascal II granted an indulgence of forty days to those who had come to Rome in connection with the Lateran Council held that year. However, the Church's return to the general use of indulgences dates back to the plenary indulgence granted by Pope Urban II in 1095.

In the final chapter of the historical synopsis the author gives a brief survey of the history of the granting of indulgences by prelates inferior in rank to the Pope, in order to establish, as clearly as possible, at precisely what period of time the various inferior grades of prelates received ordinary power to grant indulgences, as well as to trace the evolution of this power to the present time.

This historical presentation is well controlled, as is evidenced by the citation of ample source material, and the reader will find it interesting and informative.

In the canonical commentary, after a brief discussion of the nature and source of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction exercised in the granting of indulgences, the author examines the ordinary power of granting indulgences as it is enjoyed today by cardinals, archbishops, vicars and prefects apostolic, permanent apostolic administrators, and abbots and prelates *nullius*. The determinations relative to this part of the matter are arrived at not only from an analysis of the law of the Code, but also from a consideration of the recent modifications of that law which were effected by the decree issued by the Sacred Congregation of the Penitentiary on July 20, 1942.

The author concludes his study with a chapter on the subjects of indulgences. Here he examines the special qualifications which the faithful must possess in order to be able to gain indulgences granted by prelates and the extent to which a prelate can be the subject of indulgences granted by himself.

CASIMIR M. PETERSON, S.S.

THE TRAINING OF CONVERTS. Proceedings of the Fordham University Conference of Mission Specialists. First Annual Meeting, Jan. 24-25, 1953. New York: Fordham University Press, 1953. Pp. 165. $2.00.

For over thirty years an annual meeting of mission specialists has taken place at Louvain University in Belgium. The printed proceedings of the Louvain Missiology Week have come to be recognized as one of the most valuable sources of thoughtful opinion on problems bearing on the world missionary apostolate.

In other places in Europe, notably Germany, Austria, France, Spain and Italy, similar meetings are held, though Louvain continues to hold first place. This same type of missionary study conference has also been held in Canada.

Now for the first time such a gathering has been held in the United States. Fordham University has the distinction of welcoming to its campus an assembly of America's experienced missioners for their missiological week-end. Over fifty invited participants entered into the discussions.

The conference gathering considered methodically the principal phases of the year's subject, "The Training of Converts." Seven major papers, each thirty minutes long, set forth these divisions of the

subject. Each was followed by two commentaries in the way of ten minute papers prepared by participants who had previous opportunity to study the paper on which they commented. Following these papers the conference chairman led a discussion of their contents. The conference Proceedings carries all the papers as well as the discussions which followed. The result is a rather complete consideration of the training of converts in mission lands.

The seven major papers were as follows: I. *An Historical Outline of the Training of Converts,* by the late Rev. Joseph P. Ryan, M.M., Professor of History and Missiology at Maryknoll; II. *World Survey of Contemporary Training Systems for Converts,* by Very Rev. Emil G. Mommaerts, C.I.C.M., American Provincial of the Immaculate Heart Fathers; III. *An Analysis of the Catechumenate,* by Rev. J. R. Robert of the White Fathers; IV. *The Body of Doctrine and of Practices to be Taught,* by Rev. Anthony Coolen of the White Fathers; V. *The Training and World of the Catechist,* by Rev. Norbert E. Schmalz, O.F.M.; VI. *Teaching Instruments for Training Converts,* by Rev. Bernard F. Meyer of Maryknoll; VII. *Post-Baptismal Training Practices,* by Very Rev. Joseph McGlade of the Columban Fathers.

The second annual Conference of Mission Specialists, held at Fordham on Jan. 23-24, 1954, had as subject "Local Leadership in Mission Lands." The Proceedings of this conference may likewise be expected shortly.

JOHN J. CONSIDINE, M.M.

THE INDEX TO THE NEW TESTAMENT AND THE TOPICAL ANALYSIS TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Aloysius H. Seubert. San Diego, California: Universal Publications, n.d. Pp. vii+122; v+142. $10.00.

The purpose of the first part of this book is "to give to the layman a device by which he can quickly find those religious topics which arise during discussions." It is an index of topics treated in the New Testament listed in alphabetical order after the manner of a concordance. The second part of the book "has been prepared for the use of teachers, scholars, study clubs, and individuals who wish a guide in the study of the New Testament." It consists of a detailed analysis of the New Testament, chapter for chapter and verse for verse. In both sections the topics are merely listed and not explained. Both "literal and moral captions" appear, but nowhere is it made clear what the author understands by a moral caption or a moral interpretation.

Aside from the fact that the price is almost prohibitive, this book will hardly recommend itself as a scholarly and useful work. After a

brief examination of the volume, one is no longer surprised to come upon such evidences of carelessness as the following: On p. 103 of the first part "Avoid Danger . . ." should evidently read, "Avoid Anger . . ."; on p. 113 of the second part *Phil.* 3:20 is interpreted to mean that "Conversation Should be Decent"; on p. 11 of the introduction to the second part the body of the work is referred to and quoted incorrectly; under *Luke* 4:29 in the second part we read this curious caption, "Christ Given a Floater by Nazareth."

JOSEPH M. PAX, C.PP.S.

RELIGIOUS MEN AND WOMEN IN THE CODE. By Joseph Creusen, S.J. Translated by Adam C. Ellis, S.J. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1953. Pp. xiv + 322. $5.50.

The religious congresses held in our own country and in other parts of the world in recent years have stirred up within religious communities a renewed interest in the Ecclesiastical legislation governing the religious life. This interest revealed in our country a need for a practical, concise, and still sufficiently complete, up-to-date English commentary on the prescriptions of the Code of Canon Law that concern the religious life. This need is felt especially by religious women who are either unfamiliar with the Latin language or have no ready access to the more formal commentaries of the recognized Latin authors who discuss these canons. Moreover, many religious communities are instituting formal courses in Canon Law, both for superiors and for subjects. For these courses, such a commentary will prove a very suitable text.

This need both for a textbook and for a practical English commentary has been more than filled by Father Ellis, who has recently revised the fourth edition of his *Creusen on Religious Men and Women in the Code* in order to make it conform with the sixth French edition of Father Creusen, *Religieux et religieuses d'après le droit ecclésiastique.*

Those who are as yet unfamiliar with this volume by Father Ellis will find it very satisfactory. Every canon of the Code of Canon Law governing the religious life is explained briefly but satisfactorily and with a view to practical application. The division of the book into chapters and articles is made to conform with the order in which these canons appear in the Code of Canon Law. Ample references to other commentaries and to official pronouncements of the Holy See are contained in footnotes and the work contains an extensive bibliography. A complete topical index is of great assistance for ready references.